DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 072 HE 019 596

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1985. U.S. Department of Education.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	354p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, Planning and Evaluation Service, Room 3127, FOB-6, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202 (limited supply).
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC15 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Bilingual Education; Contracts; Educational Research; *Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Libraries; *Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; Student Financial Aid; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Education; Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

This report, a guide to 95 programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education, covers activities current as of September 30, 1985. Program profiles identify the enabling legislation, funding since 1981, the purpose of the program, and for some programs eligibility, strategies, and subprograms. Also specified for each program are: program objectives for fiscal year (FY) 1985, progress and accomplishments, costs and benefits, program effectiveness, highlights of activities, and a list of supporting studies and analyses. Any studies of the program that are planned or in progress are also listed, along with information contacts. The directory covers: 21 programs under the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 5 programs under the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, 25 programs under the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 7 programs under the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, 24 programs under the Office of Postsecondary Education, and 13 programs under the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. A summary of evaluation contracts active during FY 1985 is provided in an appendix. For each contract, the following data is supplied: the funding amount, brief description of the contract, the contractor's name and contract number, start and end dates, and project officer's name. An index to the 95 programs is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270072

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE019596

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

Foreword

This is the 15th annual report to the Congress on federally funded education programs and the sixth such report submitted by the Department of Education. The Annual Evaluation Report responds to the Congressional mandate in Section 417(a) and (b) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended. The information in this report covers program activities as of September 30, 1985.

This year there is information on 95 programs administered by the Department, as against the 88 programs in last year's edition. The increase in number is largely because of new programs authorized under the Education for Economic Security Act of 1984 and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. There is also a first-time chapter on the National Institute of Education, most of whose functions were transferred early in FY 1986 to the new Office of Research in the Department.

I welcome your suggestions on making the Annual Evaluation Report more useful in your work. Please direct your comments to Edward Glassman in the Planning and Evaluation Service, at (202) 245-8281 or at the address below.

Bruce Carnes

Deputy Under Secretary for
Planning, Budget and Evaluation

For copies while our limited supply lasts, contact:

Mr. Edward B. Glassman
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation
Planning and Evaluation Service
Room 3127, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgments

During FY 1985, the Planning and Evaluation Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation continued its effort to improve the technical and editorial quality of the Annual Evaluation Report. Each Division Director of PES (Robert Barnes, Salvatore Corrallo, Robert Maroney, Jay Noell, and Robert Stonehill) reviewed all work of the Division. Again this year, Edward Glassman was responsible for managing report preparation, with support from Barbara Coates, Leona Edwards, and Yvonne Briscoe. All analysts and all secretaries in PES contributed through writing, revising, and typing program chapters. Each program office helped with detailed comments on draft chapters about its own programs. As in past years, Budget Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, the Office of the Under Secretary, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of Legislation and Public Affairs, made valuable corrections and comments on draft materials for the entire report.

Alan Ginsburg

Director
Planning and Evaluation Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword ... i

Acknowledgments ... ii

1. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education — Chapter Number*

Education of Disadvantaged Children (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies ... 101
Migrant Education Program (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to State Education Agencies ... 102
Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children ... 103
Education Block Grant (Chapter 2, ECIA) Consolidation of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs ... 104
General Assistance to the Virgin Islands ... 105
Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training ... 106
Follow Through--Grants to Local Education Agencies and Other Nonprofit Agencies ... 107
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Maintenance and Operations ... 108
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Construction ... 109
Allen J. Ellender Fellowships ... 110
Indian Education--Financial Assistance to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools--Part A ... 111
Special Programs for Indian Students--Part B ... 112
Special Programs for Indian Adults--Part C ... 113
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program ... 114
Women's Educational Equity ... 115
Migrant Education--High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) ... 116
Arts in Education Program ... 117
Inexpensive Book Distribution Program ... 118
Law-Related Education ... 119
Mathematics and Science State Grants Program ... 120
Magnet Schools Assistance Program ... 121

2. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs

Bilingual Education--Discretionary Grants to Local Education Agencies ... 201
Transition Program for Refugee Children ... 202
Bilingual Education Training Programs ... 203
Bilingual Education Support Services ... 204
Emergency Immigrant Education Program ... 205

*Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

Chapter Number*

3. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State-Operated and State-Supported Schools 301
Handicapped School Programs 302
State Incentive Grants for Preschool Services to Handicapped Children 303
Handicapped Regional Resource Centers 304
Handicapped Innovative Programs--Services to Deaf-Blind Children and Youth 305
Early Childhood Education Program for Handicapped Children 306
Innovative Programs for Severely Handicapped Children 307
Postsecondary Education Progams for Handicapped Persons 308
Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped 309
Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information 310
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped--Innovation and Development Program 311
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped--Media Services and Captioned Films 312
Education of the Handicapped Act--Special Studies 313
Secondary Education and Transitional Services for Handicapped Youth 314
National Institute of Handicapped Research 324
Rehabilitation Services--Basic Support 325
Client Assistance Program (CAP) 326
Discretionary Project Grants for Training Rehabilitation Personnel 327
Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation of Severely Handicapped Individuals 328
Special Projects for Initiating Recreation Programs for Handicapped Individuals 329
Rehabilitation Services--Special Projects for Handicapped Migratory and Seasonal Farm Workers 330
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults 331
Rehabilitation Services--Projects with Industry 332
Centers for Independent Living 333
Vocational Rehabilitation Service Projects for Handicapped American Indians 334

4. Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Vocational Education--Basic Grants to States 401
Vocational Education--Special Program: Consumer and Homemaker Education 402
Vocational Education--Other Special Programs 403
Vocational Education--Research and Occupational Information 404
Vocational Education--Indian and Hawaiian Native Programs 405
Bilingual Vocational Education Programs--Discretionary Grants 406
Adult Education--Grants to States 407

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

Chapter Number*

5. Office of Postsecondary Education

Pell (Basic Educational Opportunity) Grant Progam................ 501
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program............... 502
State Student Incentive Grants................................... 503
Guaranteed Student Loan Program.................................. 504
Direct Loan Program.. 505
Work-Study Program... 506
Upward Bound... 507
Talent Search.. 508
Educational Opportunity Centers.................................. 509
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students...................... 510
Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Program............................ 511
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.............. 512
Training Program for Special Programs Staff and Leadership Personnel........................... 513
Institutional Aid Programs....................................... 514
Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program................ 515
Law School Clinical Experience Program........................... 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged............................. 517
Fellowships for Graduate and Professional Study.................. 518
Fulbright-Hays Training Grants Program........................... 519
Foreign Language Training and Area Studies....................... 520
Cooperative Education.. 521
College Housing Program.. 522
Annual Interest Subsidy Grants................................... 523
Loans for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation of Academic Facilities.. 524

6. Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Territorial Teacher Training Assistance Program.................. 601
Public Library Services--Grants to State Library Agencies....... 602
Interlibrary Cooperation--Grants to State Library Agencies...... 603
College Library Resources--Discretionary Grants.................. 604
Library Career Training--Discretionary Grants.................... 605
Library Research and Demonstrations--Discretionary Grants....... 606
Strengthening Research Library Resources--Discretionary Grants to Major Research Libraries............................ 607
Public Library Construction--Grants to State Library Agencies... 608
Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives......... 609
National Institute of Education.................................. 610
Secretary's Discretionary Program--Discretionary Activities to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education................. 611

*Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

6. Office of Educational Research and Improvement Chapter Number*

Secretary's Discretionary Program for Mathematics, Science, Computer Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages.................. 612

Excellence in Education Program.................................. 613

Appendix--Evaluation Contracts Active in OPBE During Fiscal Year 1985.. A-1

Index to the Annual Evaluation Report.................................. I-1

*Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
FORMULA GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.010)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35 (20 USC 3801-3808, 3871-3876) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Total Authorization	Total Appropriation	Appropriations for LEA Grants 1/
1981	$7,047,423,325	$3,104,317,000	$2,611,386,972
1982	3,480,000,000	3,033,969,000	2,562,753,163
1983	3,480,000,000	3,200,394,000	2,727,587,568
1984	Indefinite	3,480,000,000	3,003,680,000
1985	Indefinite	3,688,163,000	3,200,000,000

Note: The Chapter 1 program is forward-funded, e.g., funds appropriated in FY 1985 are available for use during academic year 1985-86.

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Eligibility: LEAs receive grants under Chapter 1. The size of the grant is based primarily on the number of children in low-income families within the district. Chapter 1 also makes payments to State education agencies (SEAs) for administration and for State-operated programs, to the Insular Areas, and to the Secretary of the Interior for the education of Indian children.

The Department is responsible for calculating county and then State allocations, using a formula that takes into account, among other things, the number of 5- to 17-year-old children in low-income families and the average State per pupil expenditure. SEAs are then responsible for making subcounty allocations to their LEAs. LEAs identify eligible school attendance areas with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families and provide services to low-achieving children from public and nonpublic schools who live in the eligible attendance areas.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In academic year 1984-85, the third year in which school districts provided compensatory educational services under Chapter 1, the Department's principal goals and objectives for this program were as follows:

- To enable SEAs and LEAs to implement programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children;

- To help SEAs and LEAs improve their programs;

- To improve the quality of program information by collecting information on participants' sex, race, and age (as required by P.L. 98-211); and

- To issue guidance to SEAs on how to comply with the Supreme Court decision in Aguilar v. Felton, which held that instructional services funded under Chapter 1 cannot be provided on the premises of religiously affiliated nonpublic schools.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Notices of Proposed Rulemaking for 34 CFR, Parts 200 and 204, implementing the changes enacted in the 1983 Technical Amendments, were published on August 9, 1984, and comments were due by November 9, 1984. During FY 1985, the comments were summarized and the responses to the comments were prepared for publication along with the final regulations for Parts 200 and 204. Final regulations will be published in early 1986.

  During FY 1985, the Department conducted 27 onsite State reviews of the LEA grant program portion of Chapter 1. The review teams found that local Chapter 1 programs generally are in compliance with the Chapter 1 requirements and that their fiscal accounting practices, computer data-management practices, and quality control procedures for LEA evaluation data reporting at the SEA level were satisfactory. Overall, the findings were similar to those for prior years.

- The Department helps SEAs and LEAs improve their programs through the "Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Quality of Chapter 1 ECIA Projects." The Department is continuing to sponsor (1) a national program to identify unusually successful Chapter 1 projects; (2) development of an "Effective Compensatory Education" sourcebook designed to disseminate program improvement strategies and profiles of unusually successful projects; (3) technical assistance to LEAs to implement program improvement strategies; and (4) technical assistance to recognized projects to disseminate effective program components.

  In addition, new contracts to operate four evaluation Technical Assistance Centers were awarded on September 30, 1985. As part of the "Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Quality of Chapter 1, ECIA Projects", the centers will commit at least 50 percent of their resources to help SEAs and LEAs improve their programs.

- State Performance Report forms were revised to collect information on participants' sex, race, and age (as required by (P.L. 98-211). Data for the 1984-85 academic year will be available in the spring of 1986.

- The Department published "Guidance on Aguilar v. Felton and Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA): Questions and Answers" in August 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The most recent data about this program are from the 1983-84 academic year.

- Approximately $2.73 billion was distributed to LEAs.
- Funding has increased each year since FY 1982; during the 1983-84 school year, the number of students who were served grew by more than 100,000 over the previous year's total. This represents a 2.5 percent increase in students, compared with a 6 percent increase in funds. Of the 30 States that received an increase in funds in academic year 1983-84, 23 reported serving additional students.
- States served about 4,846,000 children during the regular academic term, of whom approximately 4,621,000 attended public schools and 225,000 attended nonpublic schools.
- Nationally, approximately 11 percent of public school children received Chapter 1 services. This figure varied across States from about 4 percent to 21 percent. About 4 percent of the Nation's nonpublic school students received Chapter 1 services.

Distribution of Funds: Any district entitled to receive an allocation may apply for a Chapter 1 grant. Most districts receive grants; the data from 47 SEAs indicate that about 99 percent of large districts (those with 10,000 or more students) receive grants; a somewhat smaller percentage of small districts receive grants. The few large districts that do not receive grants tend to be relatively wealthy. Overall, however, about the same proportion of wealthy and less wealthy districts receive grants.

Children Served: Children from prekindergarten through the 12th grade received services in 1983-84, with the largest proportion in grades 1 through 6, as shown in Table 1. These percentages were approximately the same as in prior years.

Table 1

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED, 1983-84 ACADEMIC YEAR

Grade Span	Number	Percent
Pre Kindergarten and Kindergarten	348,863	7
Grades 1-3	1,773,305	37
Grades 4-6	1,565,784	32
Grades 7-9	873,946	18
Grades 10-12	284,041	6
Total	4,846,050*	100

*There were 111 students in ungraded classes who are included in the total but not in the grade-level counts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Less than half of the Chapter 1 participants were white, just over one-quarter were Black, and one-quarter were Hispanic. Comparisons with national data and with data from prior years are difficult because of incomplete and differential reporting. However, Table 2 provides a rough comparison of data for Chapter 1 participants and national census data.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAPTER 1 PARTICIPANTS BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP, 1983-84 ACADEMIC YEAR, COMPARED WITH NATIONAL CENSUS DATA
(Percent)

Race/Ethnicity	Chapter 1 Participation*		1980 Census:
	43 States, D.C., PR, and Trust Territories**	43 States and D.C.	50 States and D.C. (ages 5-19)
White, not Hispanic	43	46	75
Black, not Hispanic	28	30	14
Hispanic	25	20	8
Other	5	4	3
Total	101	100	100

*The following States did not report Chapter 1 racial/ethnic data: Connecticut, Maine, Missouri, Montana, New York, Vermont, and Washington.

**Percentage does not total 100 percent because of rounding.

Types of Benefits Provided: Students receive services in a variety of instructional and support areas, as shown in Table 3. During the 1983-84 academic year, the most common service areas were reading (75 percent of all Chapter 1 students), mathematics (46 percent), and language arts (22 percent). Twelve percent received instruction for children with limited English proficiency.

In each of these areas, more students were served in 1983-84 than in 1982-83. Approximately 100,000 additional students received services in reading, 58,000 in math, 100,000 in language arts, and 70,000 in services for children with limited English proficiency.

No more than 17 percent of students received services in any other instructional or support area.

Table 3

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES
BY SERVICE AREA, 1983-84 ACADEMIC YEAR

Service Area	Number	Percent*
Instructional		
Reading	3,613,823	75
Mathematics	2,203,489	46
Language arts	1,040,065	22
Limited English	592,062	12
Vocational	54,774	1
Special for handicapped	11,772	**
Other	436,942	9
Supporting		
Attendance, guidance	817,239	17
Health, nutrition	714,249	15
Transportation	229,558	5
Other	321,160	7

*Percentages one calculated using the total number of students served by the program (4,846,050.) The percentages do not total to 100 because students may receive services in more than one area.

**Less than 0.5 percent

Staffing: Local project funds supported approximately 155,000 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff positions during the 1983-84 academic year. As in prior years, the majority of staff (approximately 85 percent) were either teachers or teacher aides.

Student Achievement: The States reported that Chapter 1 students had the following achievement characteristics:

- In elementary school reading projects, the "average" entering Chapter 1 students scored at the 24th percentile, while in math, the typical students were at the 28th percentile.
- Considerable differences exist across States. In sixth-grade reading projects, for example, "average" pretest scores for States ranged from about the 7th percentile to the 31st percentile. In sixth-grade math, the "average" pretest scores for States ranged from the 4th to the 42nd percentile.

- High school Chapter 1 students are further behind their peers than are elementary school Chapter 1 students. This is not surprising, because far fewer high school students receive services and those who do tend to be students who are in great need.

In general, these findings are very similar to those reported for the previous years of Title I/Chapter 1.

Program Effectiveness: The reading and mathematics scores for Chapter 1 students in grades 2 through 12 are presented in Table 4. These results are from school districts that used an annual (i.e., spring-to-spring or fall-to-fall) test cycle for students who participated in Chapter 1 programs. These results should be interpreted with caution, because the evaluations may contain small biases of from one to two Normal Curve Equivalent units (NCEs), 2/ particularly in the lower grades.

Overall, scores for the school year 1983-84 were about the same as those found in prior school years and show a small gain in achievement as a result of program participation. Table 4 shows the scores from all States that reported data in aggregatable scores. Again, the scores for students tested annually are not corrected for possible bias and should be interpreted with caution.

States also reported on evaluations that employed a fall-to-spring test cycle. Studies have shown that fall-to-spring testing is likely to result in inflated estimates of student achievement. Despite possible bias in the results, we have included the national summary of fall-to-spring scores in end note 3 because a large proportion of districts employ this evaluation design. The Department encourages projects to employ annual testing, which not only produces more valid estimates of achievement but also reduces testing burden. Projects have been shifting towards annual testing. In academic year 1982-83, about one-third of the scores for reading and math achievement were based on annual testing, whereas in 1983-84, nearly half were based on annual testing.

Table 4

READING AND MATHEMATICS SCORES FOR STUDENTS TESTED ON AN ANNUAL (FALL-TO-FALL OR SPRING-TO-SPRING) SCHEDULE DURING THE 1983-84 ACADEMIC YEAR

	Reading				Mathematics			
	Weighted Number	Percentile		NCE Gain	Weighted Number	Percentile		NCE Gain
Grade	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Score	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Score
2	93,959	29	31	1.0	54,790	35	40	3.2
3	115,160	24	29	3.0	64,629	31	37	3.2
4	119,437	24	29	2.9	72,558	28	34	3.1
5	121,383	23	28	3.1	77,677	28	35	4.4
6	105,021	23	28	3.2	68,235	28	35	4.0
7	65,246	23	27	2.5	39,072	25	31	3.5
8	65,826	23	27	2.4	45,842	28	33	3.1
9	31,349	23	25	1.6	22,635	30	32	0.7
10	13,489	18	20	1.1	8,372	24	24	0.5
11	7,967	17	18	0.3	5,096	25	26	1.1
12	4,506	16	16	0.3	3,352	22	25	1.9

Program Audits: As a result of audits conducted in previous fiscal years by the Department, nine final determination letters were issued during FY 1985. Eight of the letters included findings on the use of funds for States' administration of their Title I programs. The auditors questioned or disallowed costs totaling $8.1 million; subsequently, the Department's determinations required States to refund $4 million. Principal violations found in the audits included use of Federal funds to supplant regular State and local funds, failure to document salaries of employees paid from more than one program, assignment of staff to noninstructional duties in excess of the allowable 10 percent, and expenditures of lapsed funds.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration has proposed legislation to permit LEAs and SEAs to implement Chapter 1 as a voucher program. Parents of educationally disadvantaged children selected for participation would receive vouchers for compensatory education services in public or private schools.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. State Performance Reports, 1979-80 through 1983-84.

2. State Audit Reports, U.S. Department of Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A "National assessment of compensatory education" was mandated in the 1983 ECIA Technical Amendments. OERI is managing this study, which will both reexamine educational effects of compensatory education programs on participating children and develop a national profile of Chapter 1 programs. Interim reports are due to Congress in January and July of 1986, with a final report due in January 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 245-3081

Program Studies : Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. Excludes Special Incentive Grants and State-operated programs (which include the Migrant Education Program, the Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children, and the Program for Handicapped Children).

2. NCEs are a form of standardized test scores based on percentiles and used by school districts, States, and the Department of Education for purposes of aggregation and reporting. There would be no change in NCEs when a group has stayed at exactly the same percentile from pretest to posttest; thus, an NCE gain indicates an increase in the percentile standing of a group, and an NCE loss indicates a decrease in a group's relative standing.

3. The reading and mathematics results for students tested on a fall-to-spring schedule during the 1983-84 academic year were as follows:

	Reading				Mathematics			
	Weighted Number	Percentile		NCE Gain	Weighted Number	Percentile		NCE Gain
Grade	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Score	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Score
2	182,490	21	36	9.9	63,922	21	42	12.9
3	158,221	20	32	8.2	68,215	20	38	10.8
4	140,961	20	32	7.5	68,328	22	39	10.3
5	121,558	20	30	6.7	65,350	22	36	8.8
6	106,666	20	30	6.3	55,456	22	36	8.4
7	69,429	20	28	5.6	36,483	23	34	6.3
8	49,866	20	28	5.1	28,589	23	32	6.0
9	30,818	18	26	5.3	18,012	21	32	7.2
10	17,992	18	24	4.5	7,485	23	29	4.2
11	9,737	15	20	4.1	3,297	21	30	5.9
12	5,873	14	20	4.6	1,859	22	29	4.5

MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES TO MEET THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.011)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1981	$266,400,000	$266,400,000
1982	255,744,000	255,744,000
1983	255,744,000	255,744,000
1984	258,024,000	258,024,000
1985	264,524,000	264,524,000

Purpose: To establish and improve programs to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or fishers.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- o To monitor ongoing projects and to award grants for school year 1985-86 projects,
- o To issue final program regulations reflecting the changes required by ECIA Chapter 1, and
- o To develop procedures for data collection and analysis, as required by the technical amendments to ECIA Chapter 1.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department conducted 22 onsite State program reviews. The Department awarded 51 Basic grants to the States ranging from $41,598 to $73,819,118. It also awarded 20 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants to 10 different States at an average cost of $104,000.

- o Final regulations, reflecting FY 1984 changes in the statute, were issued on April 30, 1985.
- o The Department developed and disseminated a performance report form to use in the first systematic collection of migrant education performance and achievement data from the States.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The following table indicates the number of full-time-equivalent students registered on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) since 1977. These counts serve as the basis for program funding. One full-time equivalent equals 365 days of enrollment on the MSRTS. A count of the actual number of students identified as eligible for services and enrolled on the MSRTS is also shown.

Calendar Year	Full-Time-Equivalent Students (ages 5-17)	Number of Eligible Students (under 21 years of age)
1977	296,430	467,796
1978	323,501	494,417
1979	366,460	522,154
1980	398,798	550,253
1981	417,298	577,483
1982	426,729	593,042
1983	407,650	566,422
1984	387,943	533,966

Program Effectiveness: In FY 1985, the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education released a profile of the Migrant Education Program based on the State programs' evaluation reports for FY 1981. The profile presented descriptive information on MSRTS enrollments by State and migrant status; participation information by State and by instructional or health service area for some States; staffing information for some States; and case studies of different types of achievement information reported by some States. (E. 3.) In FY 1985, the Department began the systematic analysis and synthesis of the FY 1982 and 1983 State evaluation reports. Participation and achievement information from this analysis will be available in early 1986. In FY 1985, the Department, as part of its responsibilities under GEPA 406(a), collected, analyzed, and reported information about the distribution of Migrant Education Program funds to subgrantees. (E. 2.)

D. Highlights of Activities

In FY 1985, the Department sponsored a Chapter 1 Recognition Program to identify and disseminate information about unusually successful Chapter 1 projects. Five local Migrant Education projects were among the 117 total projects identified by the Department as unusually successful. A two-volume Sourcebook describing these projects is now being developed by the Department and will be available in FY 1986. This Sourcebook will describe the 117 projects and correlate project attributes with factors in school effectiveness as identified in research literature.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1983.

2. Distribution of State-Administered Federal Education Funds: Ninth Annual Report, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., June 1985.

3. Program for Migrant Children's Education: A National Profile, National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education, Washington, D.C., 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

As mentioned in II. C. above, the Department is now analyzing and synthesizing information from recent State evaluation reports. The Department also plans to analyze and report on information from the States' newly required performance reports for FY 1985.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies : James J. English, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 1. This cap remained in effect through FY 1983. In FY 1984 and 1985, Congress set the authorization level for the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program through the appropriations process.

FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.013)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), enacted as part of Subtitle D, Title V, of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 2781) as amended (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1981	$33,975,000	$33,975,000
1982	32,616,000	32,616,000
1983	32,616,000	32,616,000
1984	32,616,000	32,616,000
1985	32,616,000	32,616,000

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to meet the special educational needs of children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or children in adult correctional institutions, for whom a State agency is directly responsible for providing free public education. The programs and projects provided must be designed to support educational services supplemental to the basic education of such children, which must be provided by the State agency.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- Issuance of final regulations for State Agency programs under ECIA Chapter 1; and
- Publication of nonregulatory guidance for State agencies' services to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Final regulations were published in the Federal Register on April 30, 1985.

- o Nonregulatory guidance for institutions for neglected and delinquent children was drafted.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: States are required to submit annual information on the number of students served by the program. On the basis of information received for the 1982-83 and 1983-84 school years, it is estimated that more than 65,000 students are served annually at a cost of approximately $500 per student.

Program Effectiveness: Each State education agency is required to conduct an evaluation at least once every two years and to make public the results of that evaluation. The States are not required to provide these reports to the Department of Education.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Secretary recognized three projects for neglected or delinquent children as unusually successful in the Chapter 1 National Recognition Program. In FY 1986 this initiative will continue to improve programs serving children in neglected or delinquent institutions.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "A Summary of 1983-84 State Evaluation Reports," U.S. Department of Education (available in early 1986).

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Department is conducting a study of the program in FY 1986. The study will summarize existing information, collect and analyze additional information from nine States, and provide case studies of nine institutions.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 245-3081

Program Studies : Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total appropriated for Chapter 1. This cap remained in effect through FY 1983. In fiscal years 1984 and 1985, Congress set the authorization level of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent program through the appropriation process.

EDUCATION BLOCK GRANT (CHAPTER 2, ECIA)
CONSOLIDATION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.151)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, P.L. 97-35, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3811-3876) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$589,368,000	$442,176,000
1983	589,368,000	450,655,000
1984	589,368,000	450,655,000
1985	589,368,000	500,000,000

Purpose: To help State and local education agencies improve elementary and secondary education, through consolidation of 42 elementary and secondary education programs into a single authorization and to reduce paperwork and assign responsibility for the design and implementation of Chapter 2 programs to local education agencies (LEAs). State education agencies (SEAs) have the basic responsibility for the administration and supervision of Chapter 2 programs.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objectives for this program in FY 1985 were as follows:

- To publish final program regulations to implement the technical amendments to Chapter 2, enacted in December 1983;
- To complete onsite program reviews of all States to obtain information about State administration of the program and to recommend changes if the State is not complying with the statute or the regulations;
- To provide technical assistance to State Chapter 2 Coordinators about program administration;
- To receive State applications for fiscal years 1985-87, to approve revised State funding distribution criteria for the 1985-86 school year, and to issue grant awards by July 1, 1985; and

- o To expand the Nonregulatory Guidance to include questions and answers that respond to findings of the program reviews.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department published final regulations implementing the technical amendments on September 18, 1985.
- o Department staff completed the 2-year cycle of program reviews in each State, visiting 29 States in FY 1985, and sent reports of the findings to each Chief State School Officer.
- o Department staff conducted a national Chapter 2 Coordinators meeting in February 1985, and participated in a meeting of the Chapter 2 National Steering Committee (June 1985).
- o The Department processed all State applications and revisions of distribution criteria and issued grant awards by July 1, 1985.
- o Department staff compiled questions to be addressed in the Nonregulatory Guidance.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

SEA Use of Funds: During FY 1983, the first year of program operations, States reserved for their own use more than $83 million (or 19.0 percent of the total granted to States). Of this amount, States allocated 12.9 percent for administration, 7.4 percent for Subchapter A (Basic Skills), 73.6 percent for Subchapter B (Educational Improvement & Support), and 6.1 percent for Subchapter C (Special Projects). States allocated more than 51 percent of their reserved funds to "Improving Planning/Management/Implementation of Educational Programs," a purpose under Subchapter B (E.1). Although some States amended their spending plans for FY 1985, this information remains substantially the same.

State evaluation reports contained extensive descriptions of activities supported by Chapter 2 during FY 1984. In synthesizing the 32 reported received, to capture the diverse ways in which States used their retained funds (E.2), Department staff classified State activities into the 12 categories that had been authorized under the Title V-B program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (a Chapter 2 precursor).

Activity Category	Number of States
1. Develop more equitable school finance mechanisms	2
2. Enhance the analysis of State educational issues by other government branches	11
3. Develop statewide student assessment programs	12
4. Provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve planning, program management, citizen involvement, and staff development	26
5. Provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve instruction, including ways for parents to help their children	28
6. Conduct workshops to facilitate communication among educators and between educators and the public	17
7. Disseminate information regarding effective education practices	11
8. Coordinate programs in public schools with those in private schools; monitor Federal requirements for program participation of private school students	4
9. Provide professional development for SEA employees	3
10. Develop curricular materials and programs	14
11. Strengthen internal SEA resources	18
12. Make direct grants to LEAs	11

Cutting across these categories, 10 SEAs reported using Chapter 2 funds for statewide school improvement initiatives. States supported commissions to develop statewide action plans; task forces to recommend changes in curricular standards; and teacher training institutes in the fields of mathematics, science, and computer science.

LEA Use of Funds: Twenty-four States provided information in their Chapter 2 evaluations regarding LEAs' use of funds. A summary of these data (E.2) indicates that LEAs allocated 4.0 percent of their funds for Subchapter A, 88.7 percent for Subchapter B, and 7.3 percent for Subchapter C. The largest single purpose, accounting for 49.9 percent of the LEAs' funds, was Instructional Materials/School Library Resources. LEAs allocated 5.0 percent of their funds to support activities identified as desegregation assistance. Other former categorical programs received minimal support, ranging from zero funding for International Understanding to 5.0 percent for Teacher Corps/Teacher Centers.

Student Participation in Chapter 2: Twenty-nine State evaluations included participation counts for public and private school students (E.2). Because students may be served by more than one activity supported by Chapter 2 (e.g., computer instruction and additional library acquisitions), the total number of students is a duplicated count. The totals show that 22,142,401 public school students and 2,559,004 private school students received benefits in the 1983-84 school year.

Program Effectiveness

State Program Administration: The Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted State-level systems reviews (E.3) in a sample of nine States to examine and test various administrative and fiscal control systems. The following administrative shortcomings were cited:

System	Typical Problems (Occurring In More Than One State)
Systems to conduct administrative responsibilities (review of applications, service to private school students)	Lack of written procedures for LEA application or report review; insufficient evidence of equitable services to private school students
Systems to maintain fiscal control	Incorrect calculation of allocations; improvement needed to ensure use of funds within grant period
Systems to comply with maintenance of effort (MOE)	Lack of data and procedure to calculate MOE
Systems to keep draw downs of Chapter 2 funds to a minimum	Use of advances and predetermined quarterly payments instead of provision of funds to LEAs on a current-need basis
Systems for conduct of Chapter 2 audits	Lack of plans for conducting LEA audits on schedule; lack of procedures for reviewing LEA audit reports

Local Program Administration: Onsite monitoring of States' Chapter 2 administrative practices in 29 States during FY 1985 (E.4) found a significant reduction in LEAs' administrative and paperwork burden as a result of the Chapter 2 program. State evaluation reports (E.2) described LEAs' proficiency in completing the Chapter 2 application process and in maintaining financial and program records.

LEA Administration of Services to Private School Students: The Department sponsored a short-term field study to examine this phase of LEA administration (E.5). The study team obtained information by (1) conducting telephone interviews with State and local Chapter 2 administrators, (2) examining State and local documents provided by some 20 SEAs and 50 LEAs, and (3) visiting eight LEAs. Although the field study sought to identify and describe effective administrative practices, only a very few of the districts studied seemed to have consistently noteworthy practices. Moreover, a number of practices that were deemed sensible and effective--practices that resulted in smooth public-private working relationships and in appropriate, equitable services for private school students--may not be in strict compliance with the law.

LEA Program Effectiveness: The final report of the nine State case studies of program implementation (E.6) identified some activities related to educational improvement:

- Under Chapter 2, participation by both LEAs and private school students increased, compared with participation under earlier programs.
- Chapter 2 funds supported, totally or partially, high-priority district programs.
- Use of Chapter 2 funds for computers and related expenditures reflected the results of long-range planning; this LEA priority was sometimes related to State goals for computer literacy and technological development.
- Chapter 2 funds enabled some LEAs to continue staff development programs in the face of insufficient local resources.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "How SEAs Plan to Expend the Block Grant Funds Reserved for Their Own Use," Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April 1983.
2. "Synthesis of States' FY 1984 Chapter 2 Evaluations" (in draft), Department of Education, Washington, D.C., August 1985.
3. "OIG State Systems Review Reports," Department of Education, Washington, D.C., Summer 1985.
4. "FY 1985 Chapter 2 State Monitoring Reports," Department of Education, Washington, D.C., completed during FY 1985.

5. "Administering ECIA Chapter 2 Services for Students in Private Schools: Some Selected State and Local Practices," Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., September 1985.

6. "Kaleidoscopes II: The Implementation and Impact of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act in Nine Selected States," E.H. White and Company, Washington, D.C., May 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The following study by the Department of Education was scheduled for completion in January 1986: "A Study of Local Operations Under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act."

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Allen J. King, (202) 245-7965

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

GENERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
(No CFDA number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1978, Title XV, Part C, Section 1524, P.L. 95-561, as amended by P.L. 98-511 (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$5,000,000	$2,700,000
1982	2,700,000	1,920,000
1983	2,700,000	1,920,000
1984	2,700,000	1,920,000
1985	5,000,000	2,700,000

Purpose: To provide general assistance to improve public education in the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: Only the Virgin Islands are eligible for funds. This direct entitlement program is administered by a signed agreement between the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Education of the Virgin Islands.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The FY 1985 application from the Virgin Islands identified the following objectives:

- To complete activities related to the construction and renovation of two curriculum centers and other educational facilities and
- To correct an asbestos health hazard in all public education facilities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Full implementation of the FY 1985 objectives was delayed because funds were withheld pending the final decision in United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago. However, the Department authorized the use of funds late in the fiscal year, and the following activities were accomplished in FY 1985:

- Two curriculum centers were completed.
- Roof repairs on two schools were completed.

- Security systems were completed for almost all educational facilities.
- An agricultural program was 85 percent completed.
- About one-third of the construction of Eudora Kean High School and one-third of the construction of additional classrooms for the Gomez School were completed.

C. Costs and Benefits

No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The program has been reauthorized through FY 1988 by P.L. 98-511.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program grantee files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ron Davis, (202) 245-7965

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

CIVIL RIGHTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING
(CFDA No 84.004)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV, P.L. 88-352 (20 U.S.C. 2000c-2000c-5) (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$37,111,000
1982	$37,100,000	24,000,000
1983	37,100,000	24,000,000
1984	37,100,000	24,000,000
1985	37,100,000	24,000,000

Purpose: To provide technical assistance, training, and advisory services to school districts that are coping with the special educational problems caused by the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools with respect to race, sex, and national origin. In FY 1985, the Department made awards under two Title IV programs: State education agency (SEA) projects and desegregation assistance centers (DACs).

II. PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To increase the number of SEAs participating in this program and their capacity for assisting desegregating school districts within their States, and

- To strengthen cooperation among DACs and SEAs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The number of SEA awards made between FY 1984 and 1985 increased 3.1 percent.

- Each DAC continuation application includes provisions for strengthening cooperation between the DACs and SEAs.

C. Costs and Benefits

Grants Awarded: The following table presents data on FY 1985 Title IV awards (E.1).

Category	Total Applications	Total Awards	Percent of Applicants Funded	Total Obligation	Average Award
Race					
DAC	17	17	100	$ 4,592,604	$270,153
SEA	34	33	97	4,845,161	146,823
Sex					
DAC	12	12	100	2,470,680	205,890
SEA	43	42	98	5,109,825	121,662
National Origin					
DAC	11	11	100	2,936,716	266,974
SEA	37	34	92	4,045,014	118,971
TOTAL	154	149		$24,000,000	

Program Scope: In FY 1985, 149 awards were made. Of these, 109 were for SEAs and 40 were for DACs. Approximately $14 million was used for grants to SEAs and $10 million for grants to DACs. However, FY 1985 Title IV applicants have not received their full FY 1985 awards; $15,948,000 of the FY 1985 funds was used to support FY 1984 projects that had not received funds because of the Federal District Court's impoundment of FY 1984 Title IV funds in *United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago.* At such time as the Federal District Court releases the frozen FY 1984 funds, accounting adjustments will be made so that the 1985 Title IV applicants can be fully funded according to the Secretary's recommendations.

Program Effectiveness: SEAs and DACs provided technical assistance in areas relating to desegregation on the basis of race, sex, and national origin, for examples, in the preparation and adoption of race desegregation plans, in the development of programs to increase understanding of public school personnel concerning the problems of sex bias, and in the development of instructional programs for students whose dominant language is not English.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department continues to emphasize capacity building within SEAs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Examination of program grantee files.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOLLOW THROUGH--GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NONPROFIT AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INSTITUTIONS TO PROVIDE COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME CHILDREN IN THE PRIMARY GRADES (CFDA No. 84.014)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Follow Through Act; Subchapter C of Chapter 8 of Subtitle A of Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (42 U.S.C. 9861 et seq). Section 561(a) of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (20 U.S.C. 3811) consolidates Follow Through into the Chapter 2 Block Grant Program on a phased basis (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$100,000,000	$26,250,000
1982	44,300,000	19,440,000
1983	22,150,000	19,440,000
1984	14,767,000	14,767,000
1985	10,000,000	10,000,000

Purpose: To assist the overall development of children from low-income families enrolled in kindergarten through third grade, and to amplify the educational gains made by such children in Head Start and other preschool programs of similar quality by (1) implementing innovative educational approaches; (2) providing comprehensive support services; (3) conducting the programs in a context of effective community service and parental involvement; and (4) documenting those models found to be effective.

Eligibility: Since 1972, grants have been made only on a continuation basis; hence to be eligible for a Follow Through grant an applicant must have received a Follow Through grant the preceding fiscal year.

Program Activities: Follow Through provides discretionary grants to local education agencies (LEAs) to operate projects; to institutions of higher education and regional laboratories to develop and sponsor the instructional models used in Follow Through sites; and to selected local projects to conduct demonstration activities. For each project, an LEA is required to use an innovative instructional model; to provide comprehensive services and special activities in the areas of physical and mental health, social services, and nutrition; and to conduct the program with effective community service and parental involvement. Some large districts use more than one model and thus have multiple projects. Sixteen of the local project grantees participating in Follow Through also function as resource centers and provide demonstration services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

"A Descriptive Overview of Title IV Desegregation Assistance Centers," Advanced Technology, Inc., 1985.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Curtis F. Coates, (202) 245-2181

Program Studies : Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To provide timely review of grant continuation proposals and
- To encourage presentation of individual project data to the Department's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- During FY 1985 awards were made to 58 LEAs, 15 model sponsors, and 16 resource centers.
- Applications for review by the JDRP are being evaluated by the program staff.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Follow Through currently serves approximately 20,000 children at about $500 per child. In FY 1985, the program committed funds as follows:

58 LEAs	$8,472,870
15 Model sponsors	842,102
16 Resource Centers	685,028
Total	$10,000,000

Full grants for the 1985-86 school year have not been awarded because of litigation between the Department and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. The remaining $4 million of FY 1985 funds is being withheld pending the final court decision.

Program Effectiveness: No current information is available (see FY 1983 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Follow Through Grantee Reports, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Eugene Thurman, (202) 245-9877

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS (CFDA No. 84.041)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-874 (20 U.S.C. 236), as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, 98-94 and 98-511 (expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$1,487,700,000	$706,750,000
1982	455,000,000	437,800,000
1983	455,000,000	460,200,000 1/
1984	565,000,000	580,000,000 2/
1985	740,000,000	675,000,000

Purpose: To help compensate local education agencies (LEAs) for the loss of taxable property and the cost of educating additional children when enrollments and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities, and to help LEAs affected by natural disasters.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives were to implement the provisions of P.L. 81-874, as amended, and to publish final regulations governing the determination of local contribution rates.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

For 1985, the Impact Aid program assisted LEAs serving 336,000 children who lived on Federal property and whose parents worked on Federal property or were in the uniformed services. The program assisted 1,700,000 children who lived on Federal property or whose parents worked on Federal property or were in the uniformed services.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, 2,896 LEAs have received payments to date, compared with 2,582 in FY 1984. The increase is the result of the elimination of a provision in the appropriations laws for fiscal years 1982-84 that prohibited entitlement payments of less than $5,000.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1982 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department published final regulations governing the determination of local contribution rates for payments under Section 3 of P.L. 81-874.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

In FY 1985, an analysis of the local, State, and Federal costs of processing applications for funds under Section 3 of the Impact Aid program was completed by one of the Department's contractors (Applied Systems Institute). The contractor also examined the effects on a number of districts of the $5,000 minimum payment provision on a number of districts. The report of the study's findings is almost finished.

Another contractor, Pelavin Associates, began a longer-term study of a number of districts that have large proportions of students whose parents work for the Federal Government or are in the uniformed services, and that have substantial areas of tax-exempt Federal property within their boundaries. Three case studies have been conducted; one report has been finished and the other two reports have been drafted. Two additional case studies have been started. All these studies examine the fiscal circumstances of the districts and attempt to identify the extent of the burden on these districts caused by Federal activities.

The General Accounting Office, at the request of Congress, began another study related to the Impact Aid program in 1985. This study is examining the funding of Section 6 schools and considering the effects of transferring the responsibility for the children served by these schools to neighboring public school districts. Most of these schools serve children who live on military installations; public schools were either unavailable or inappropriate at the time the Section 6 arrangements were established.

Prior to FY 1982, the funds for Section 6 were appropriated to the Department of Education for distribution. Since 1982, the funds have been appropriated to the Department of Defense, although the Department of Education retains some administrative responsibility. Because this activity requires a substantial investment of Federal funds each year, the Congress wants to consider alternatives ways of serving the children attending these schools.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stan Kruger, (202) 245-8427

Program Studies : Murray Spitzer, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. Amount provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions.
2. Includes $15 million supplement for disaster assistance.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): CONSTRUCTION (CFDA No. 84.040)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-815 (20 U.S.C. 631-645,647) as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, 98-8, and 98-511 (expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$50,000,000
1982	$20,000,000	19,200,000
1983	20,000,000	80,000,000 [1]
1984	20,000,000	20,000,000
1985	Indefinite	20,000,000

Purpose: To construct and repair or provide grants to local education agencies (LEAs) for the construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities when the enrollment and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to implement the provisions of P.L. 81-815, as amended.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1985, program funds provided direct assistance to 48 local education agencies in 10 States and 2 Outlying Areas, including funds for two new school construction projects and for three ongoing school construction projects for children on Indian lands. Nineteen projects were funded to carry out emergency repairs on federally owned school buildings.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, this program funded a total of 67 projects.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1982 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stan Kruger, (202) 245-8427
Program Studies : Murray Spitzer, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Amounts provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions and Jobs Bill Supplemental Appropriation.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS
(CFDA No. 84.148)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program, P.L. 92-506--Joint Resolution of October 19, 1972, as amended (86 Stat. 907-908) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
1982	1,000,000	960,000
1983	1,000,000	3,000,000 1/
1984	1,500,000	1,500,000
1985	1,500,000	1,500,000

Purpose: To make a grant to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D.C., for fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers in schools throughout the country and Puerto Rico and overseas schools of the Department of Defense to learn about representative government and the democratic process.

Eligibility: Economically disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers are eligible to apply for fellowships from the Close Up Foundation. Fellowships are awarded annually on the basis of equitable geographic distribution and community interest.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to award funds to the Close Up Foundation so that it could provide fellowships for low-income secondary school students and their teachers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded this grant in FY 1985 as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The program consists of a week-long series of meetings, seminars, and workshops with Members of Congress, members of the Executive and Judicial branches of government, congressional committee staff members, lobbyists, reporters, foreign government representatives, and others. Since the program began, approximately 162,000 students and teachers from

50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Department of Defense Overseas Schools have participated in the Washington Close Up Program. Students from schools for the hearing and visually impaired across the Nation also participated.

Since 1979, in an effort to reach additional secondary school students and teachers with citizenship education programs, the Close Up Foundation has telecast Washington Seminars over Cable TV (C-SPAN). The seminars included discussions between Washington leaders and high school students, many of whom were Ellender Fellowship recipients. More than 3,500 secondary schools have access to these programs.

Close Up also publishes materials including a Teachers Guide to C-SPAN; Current Issues, a book that examines contemporary questions; Perspectives, a book of readings on government operations with articles by leaders in Congress, the executive and judicial branches, and others; The Washington Notebook, a workbook designed to help prepare students for their Washington experience; and U.S.-Soviet Relations.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report).

D. Highlights of Activities

Fellowships under this program were made to approximately 5,600 students and teachers in 1985. These grants, which included costs of room, board, tuition, administration, insurance, and transportation, averaged about $570 per participant. Of this, $269 was Federal money, the rest was private matching funds.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Doris Shakin, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. In 1983 the Congress appropriated a double amount in order to place the program on a forward-funded basis. The appropriation for 1983 provided $1.5 million for school year 1982-83 and $1.5 million for school year 1983-84.

INDIAN EDUCATION--FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN-- PART A (CFDA Nos. 84.060 and 84.072)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part A, as amended (20 U.S.C. 241aa-ff) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1981	$722,214,792	$58,250,000
1982	667,770,717	54,960,000
1983	775,442,755	48,465,000
1984	814,200,000	50,900,000
1985	Indefinite	50,323,000

Purpose: Part A of the Indian Education Act supports programs to address the educational and culturally related academic needs of Indian students in public schools, tribal schools, and in reservation-based, Indian-controlled schools. Objectives for the program include (1) improving academic performance in the basic skills; (2) reducing dropout rates and improving attendance; (3) increasing Indian parental participation in educational policymaking; and (4) helping public schools become more responsive to the needs of Indian children.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Tribal Schools: Part A grants are made on a formula basis to LEAs 1/. LEAs are eligible if they enroll at least 10 Indian children or if Indian children constitute at least 50 percent of the total enrollment. These limitations do not apply to LEAs located in Alaska, California, or Oklahoma, or located on, or in proximity to, an Indian reservation. Certain tribal schools are treated as LEAs and thus can receive formula grants under this program.

Assistance to Indian-Controlled Schools: The Indian-controlled schools program is authorized by a set-aside amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the Part A formula program. Tribes and Indian organizations and certain LEAs that operate schools on or near reservations may compete for funds in two areas: (1) to start and establish a school; and (2) to develop special enrichment programs that are supplemental to an already established program. Many, but not all, of these schools are also eligible for formula grants.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To publish revised Indian Education Act regulations and
- To audit at least one-third of the local Part A projects and to provide technical assistance as needed to correct specific deficiencies or to improve the overall effectiveness of local projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Revised final regulations to implement technical changes made by the Education Amendments of 1984 were published on March 18, 1985.
- In 1985, 379 projects, representing more than one-third of Part A grants, were audited and an Audit Report was sent to Congress in October, 1985. The projects audited were located in 34 States and served 76,500 students at an average cost of $186 per student. 2/

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: In FY 1985, formula grants totaling nearly $46 million were awarded to 1,076 public and 55 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) contract schools. Public school grantees served 319,654 students and BIA schools served 9,844 students with $45,903,023 of Part A funds. The average award was $40,586 for an average expenditure per student of $139. An additional $4,409,486 went to 34 Indian-controlled schools serving 5,300 students. The average award was $129,691 and the average expenditure per student was $832. (See E.1.)

Types of Services Provided: The Audit Report describes the types of programs surveyed. Seventy-nine percent of the projects offered academic skills and 69 percent offered cultural enrichment programs. Most projects addressing the need to improve academic skills used tutorial services as all or a portion of their academic program. Math and reading tutorial services were found in 59 percent; social studies, 35 percent; and writing, 34 percent. Academic support services included personal counseling, career counseling, postsecondary education planning, health and related services, and home school relations. (See E.1.)

Program Effectiveness: The Audit Report indicates that the most successful programs were those designed to improve attendance, increase parent participation, reduce dropout rates, and improve academic skills. Program reviewers reported that projects reviewed in FY 1983 showed lower rates of success in addressing the needs of students than projects reviewed in FY 1982. However, the program reviewers recommended that 30 percent of the projects improve their evaluation methods to measure outcomes more effectively.

The Department and the Education Resource and Evaluation Centers are providing workshops to help LEAs improve their needs assessment techniques and program design, and generally to develop better performance evaluation strategies to document program effectiveness.

The most significant problem identified during the FY 1984 program site reviews continued to be the difficulty that Part A projects had in maintaining complete files to verify student eligibility. Twenty-six percent of the projects reviewed did not have forms on file for all students counted for funding under Part A of the Indian Education Act.

The Department mailed a letter to all Part A projects funded for FY 1985 to clarify its policy on the minimum information required to verify the eligibility of Indian children for Part A funds. The Department will give LEAs that appear to be out of compliance an opportunity to provide this information. If the LEAs still do not provide the information, the Department will either reduce the LEAs' grant amount or reclaim funds representing the number of ineligible children claimed by the LEA.

Further information about program effectiveness based on the Impact Study of Part A programs in public schools was summarized in the Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1984.

D. Highlights of Activities

Various aspects of the program are being reviewed to help the Department determine the need for revised legislation and future budget levels.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Report to the Congress on the Annual Program Site Reviews for Fiscal Year 1984 Funds (School Year 1984-85). October 21, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of Indian-controlled schools is in progress. The final report is expected in 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Ryan, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Authorization figures are based on a formula that weights Indian student counts by average per-pupil expenditures in the State. Actual grants are ratably reduced in proportion to the amount of the appropriation. The Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 85-511, authorizes a total ceiling of $100 million for FY 1985 for all programs authorized by Indian Education Act.

2. Report to the Congress on the Annual Program Site Reviews for Fiscal Year 1984 Funds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN STUDENTS--PART B
(CFDA Nos. 84.061 and 84.087)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 422, 423, and 1005, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part B, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3385 and 3385a and b) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$37,000,000	$14,500,000
1982	37,000,000	14,880,000
1983	37,000,000	12,600,000
1984	37,000,000	12,000,000
1985	37,000,000	11,760,000

Purpose: Part B authorizes a variety of discretionary programs designed to improve the quality of educational programs for Indians. Specific activities authorized under Part B include the following:

- Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to plan for, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of educational approaches for Indian students at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels.

- Educational service projects to serve Indian preschool, elementary, and secondary school students if other educational programs or services are not available to them in sufficient quantity or quality. Eligible recipients are State education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions.

- Educational personnel development projects to train Indians for careers in education. There are two programs: Section 1005(d), making awards primarily to universities, and Section 422, making awards primarily to Indian tribes and organizations.

- Fellowships for Indian students in the fields of medicine, psychology, law, education, business administration, engineering, and natural resources. Awards are based on financial need, academic record, other potential for success, and likelihood of service to Indians upon graduation. Priority is given to graduate students in business administration, engineering, and natural resources or related fields.

- Resource and Evaluation Centers to provide technical assistance and disseminate information to Indian education projects and applicants. The centers conduct workshops, make site visits, and prepare and distribute printed materials.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To support an appropriate mix of projects that address the full range of authorized activities and
- To improve the representation of Indians in specific professions through increased emphasis on graduate work in these fields.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1985, 32 educational service projects; 24 planning, pilot, and demonstration projects; and 15 educational personnel development projects were awarded to LEAs, Indian tribes, Indian organizations, Indian institutions, and institutions of higher education. These projects covered early childhood programs, the training of teachers and administrators, outreach tutoring programs, and similar activities.
- Graduate fellowships in FY 1985 amounted to 128 out of 211. Compared with FY 1984, this represents about a 5 percentage point increase in the proportion of graduate awards.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Part B funds supported 71 discretionary grants, 211 fellowships, and 5 Resource and Evaluation Centers. During the 1984-85 school year, these centers conducted 190 workshops, and made approximately 570 site visits to provide technical assistance to Title IV grantees.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D., E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new studies are planned or under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Ryan, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN ADULTS--PART C
(CFDA No. 84.062)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 315, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part C, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1211a) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$8,000,000	$5,430,000
1982	8,000,000	5,430,000
1983	8,000,000	5,213,000
1984	8,000,000	5,531,000 1/
1985	8,000,000	2,940,000

Purpose: Part C authorizes a range of activities designed to improve educational opportunities below the college level for Indian adults. Program objectives include increasing literacy, improving basic skills, and increasing the number of Indian adults who pass the high school equivalency examination. Specific activities authorized by Part C include the following:

- Educational service projects to provide educational opportunities for Indian adults. Projects focus on adult basic education to develop literacy and basic skills and on secondary education, including preparation for the high school equivalency examination. Many projects also offer consumer education and special services needed by adult students, such as academic and career counseling, aptitude and vocational testing, and job referral.

- Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate innovative approaches to adult education specifically designed for Indian adults.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

In FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to emphasize delivery of services, especially in areas where similar types of services are not offered.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Educational services projects accounted for 40 percent of all FY 1985 Part C funds, compared with 60 percent the previous year. Information has not yet been compiled which would permit a judgment of the extent to which new grant recipients are offering services not otherwise available in their areas.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Educational service awards totaling $1,176,000 were made in FY 1985. An additional $1,764,000 in awards went to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects.

Program Effectiveness: A recently completed study based on site visits to 14 FY 1984 projects, a review of administrative records, and guidance from a panel of experts in Indian or adult education has provided findings on the following aspects of the Part C programs:

- Compliance. Part C projects are doing what the law and regulations intend; no unauthorized uses of Part C funds were found.
- Service priorities. Eleven of the 14 sampled projects are providing one or both of the most needed types of service--basic adult education and preparation for the General Equivalency Development (GED) examination. The remaining three projects are concentrating on curriculum development.
- Project activities as related to type of grant. A service orientation predominates even in planning, pilot, and demonstration projects. Applications of these types appear to be primarily a response to announced funding levels and a preference for more flexibility in instructional methods.
- Duplication of services. Although the panel noted that there was considerable potential for duplication of services because of the proximity of some Part C projects to service facilities funded by BIA or under Section 306 of the Adult Education Act, the panel found only one verified instance where similar services were being offered to the same adult Indian population.

The expert panel's recommendations included giving an increased share of the total awards to service projects, favoring applications that address the needs of previously unserved groups, and strengthening the Department's monitoring and technical assistance activities.

D. Highlights of Activities

The program was evaluated and found to be fully in compliance with the applicable law and regulations. (See Section C for details).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. An Evaluation of the Indian Education Act, Title IV, Part C: Education for Indian Adults, Pelavin Associates, Washington, D.C., 1985.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further studies are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Ryan, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Note

1. Includes supplemental 1983 appropriation of $1,938,000 available until expended.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, Subchapter D, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$18,000,000	$2,850,000
1982	3,000,000	2,850,000
1983	1/	2,850,000
1984	1/	2,850,000
1985	1/	3,000,000

Purpose: To help schools and communities become aware of the complexity of the alcohol and drug abuse problem and to develop strategies that attack the causes rather than merely the symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated school-community effort in preventive education, with an emphasis on reducing the socially disruptive behaviors often associated with abuse.

Method of Operation: Contracts are awarded to five Regional Training and Resource Centers. These centers award subcontracts to public school districts and private schools for training school teams in devising and applying methods of dealing with each team's unique alcohol and drug abuse problem. The ultimate beneficiaries of this training are students in grades 7-12; the training is provided at the regional centers. The remaining program funds support a contractor that provides a national data base and program support and collects evaluation data from subcontractors.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objectives for FY 1985 were as follows:

- To manage the contractors who provide for training teams of school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, students, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders to prevent or reduce destructive behavior associated with alcohol and drug abuse;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- o To evaluate the results of the national Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program; and
- o To provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies and individuals.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o In FY 1985, 137 new school teams were trained; 481 additional teams received technical assistance, as did all 50 State education agencies.
- o The National Data Base and Program Support Project contracted for an analysis and summary of reported school team survey results on the effects of alcohol and drug abuse education activities.
- o The Department sponsored a meeting for contract staff to review ongoing activities and to set FY 1986 performance goals. The Department responded to requests for information about effective alcohol and drug abuse education strategies.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program has established teams of school and community personnel supported with training and followup assistance in every State and Territory. Now in its 13th year, the program has trained 5,000 teams throughout the country. Currently 617 teams are served by the national system of regional centers. According to progress reports from 440 of those teams (E.1), numerous subteams have been generated. Parent subteams accounted for 226 of these and community subteams for 165. The 440 reporting teams are working in 617 schools, which enroll 400,000 children.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education requires and stimulates a great deal of volunteer effort; in FY 1985, volunteers contributed 331,614 hours to team activities (E.1). In addition to contributions of time, private funding for team activities exceeded $275,000; the total value of private contributions for FY 1985 was reported at almost $4.2 million, which is roughly twice last year's funding total for reporting teams.

Program Effectiveness: An analysis was performed on survey results submitted by school teams on the effectiveness of alcohol and drug abuse education programs (E.2). Information from 60 (44 percent) of the 137 active teams was analyzed regarding two measures of drug use: (1) reported changes in the number of students using a particular category of drug and (2) reported changes in the average number of days per month students use a particular drug.

For comparison purposes the teams were divided into two groups: (1) teams whose activities could be expected to affect their students directly vs. (2) teams which either had not implemented activities or whose activities could not be expected to affect students directly. Teams in the first group showed an impact on student behavior but only when more than one direct-impact activity was carried out. When such cases (31 schools) were compared with all others (29 schools), these results were observed:

- The number of students who reported using tobacco decreased by 16 percent and the average days per month students reported using tobacco decreased 27 percent.
- The number of students who reported drinking alcohol decreased 20 percent and the average days per month students reported drinking alcohol decreased 24 percent.
- The number of students who reported smoking marijuana decreased 11 percent and the average number of days per month students reported using marijuana decreased 39 percent.
- The number of students who reported using other illegal drugs decreased 24 percent, and the average days per month students reported using other illegal drugs decreased 26 percent.

D. Highlights of Activities

There is to be more emphasis on developing parent action teams and student action teams in the program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. National Data Base Summary Sheet, National Data Base and Support Project, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, September 1985.
2. Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program, Ralph B. Earle, Jr., December 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program is requiring all subcontractors to design and implement their own evaluations and to provide the evaluation data to the National Data Base and Program Support Project.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Myles Doherty, (202) 755-0410

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D (the Secretary's Discretionary Fund). The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program of $2,850,000.

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY
(CFDA 84.083)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) of 1974 (Title IX, Part C of ESEA 1965), as amended (20 U.S.C. 3341-3348) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$80,000,000	$8,125,000
1982	6,000,000	5,760,000
1983	6,000,000	5,760,000
1984	6,000,000	5,760,000
1985	10,000,000	6,000,000

Purpose: To promote educational equity for women and girls in the United States and to provide Federal funds to help education agencies and institutions meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Program Strategies: The legislation authorizes two programs of contracts and grants. The first is a program to demonstrate, develop, and disseminate activities of national, State or general significance. The Department tries to ensure geographic diversity and to avoid supporting previously funded ideas. Second is a program to assist projects of local significance, including support for programs to achieve compliance with Title IX. The legislation formerly stipulated that the Department could provide assistance to projects of local significance only when appropriations for the program exceed $15 million; hence, the provision has never been implemented. The 1984 amendments, however, authorize the use of funds in excess of $6 million for activities under either or both programs.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

o To make grants according to the following distribution among the program priorities established by regulation:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Priorities	1985 Planned Distribution (Percent)
1. Projects on Title IX compliance	15
2. Projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women and girls	20
3. Projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls	15
4. Projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration	0
5. Projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women	30
6. Other authorized activities	20

- To produce and market approved model products and strategies through the WEEA Publishing Center, as authorized in Section 932(a)(1) of the Act.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Fifty-three new grant awards and six continuation awards were made as follows:

	1985 Actual Distribution of Grants			
	New	Continuation	Total	(Percent)
1. Projects on Title IX compliance	8	0	8	(14)
2. Projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women	14	3	17	(29)
3. Projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls	6	2	8	(14)
4. Projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration	0	0	0	
5. Projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women	16	1	17	(29)
6. Other authorized activities	9	0	9	(15)
Total	53	6	59	(101) 1/

- The WEEA Publishing Center conducted three technical assistance workshops on product development and marketing for the FY 1984 WEEA grantees. The workshops took place in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York.

~95

C. Costs and Benefits

No new information. (please see FY 1983 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

- o Technical amendments were developed to modify existing program regulations in conformance with the new statutory requirements. A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be published to implement programs of local significance and to simplify current regulations governing programs of general significance.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Department of Education has contracted for a descriptive review of the WEEA program which was to be completed in January 1986. The project involved the review of administrative records, interviews with WEEA and WEEA publishing center staff, and review of available data on women's progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Janice Williams-Madison, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. The percent column totals 101 percent due to rounding.

MIGRANT EDUCATION
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM (HEP)
AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM (CAMP)
(CFDA Nos. 84.141 and 84.149)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 418A, P.L. 89-329, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1070d-2) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation	
	(Both Programs)	HEP	CAMP
1981	$9,600,000	$6,095,000	$1,208,000
1982	7,500,000	5,851,200	1,159,680
1983	7,500,000	6,300,000	1,200,000
1984	8,250,000	6,300,000	1,950,000 1/
1985	7,500,000	6,300,000	1,200,000

Purpose: HEP and CAMP help students who are engaged, or whose families are engaged, in migrant or other seasonal farm work. Grants for both HEP and CAMP are made to institutions of higher education or to other public or nonprofit private agencies that cooperate with such an institution.

HEP helps students obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or to begin postsecondary education or training. HEP provides outreach, teaching, counseling, and placement services in order to recruit and serve eligible migrant and seasonal farm worker dropouts who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. HEP participants may receive room and board and stipends for their personal expenses. Most are housed on a college or university campus and may use the cultural, recreational, health, and other campus facilities.

CAMP helps students enrolled in the first undergraduate year at an institution of higher education to pursue successfully a program of postsecondary education. The services CAMP provides include tutoring, social counseling, and assistance to students in obtaining grants, loans, and work-study funds to be used for the remaining three undergraduate school years. CAMP participants may receive tuition, room and board, and stipends for personal expenses.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to make grant awards for the 1985-86 school year.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded 22 HEP grants to institutions of higher education and associated public or nonprofit, private agencies located in 15 States and Puerto Rico; it awarded 5 CAMP grants to IHEs in 3 States (Idaho, Texas and Washington).

C. Costs and Benefits

HEP Program Scope: The 22 HEP projects for school year 1985-86 are serving approximately 2,900 students. Project enrollments range between 50 and 260. The total funding for the HEP projects was $6,300,000. The average cost per per participant in HEP was $2,172.

CAMP Program Scope: A total of 395 students were served through the 1985-86 CAMP programs; enrollment in the five funded projects ranged from 25 to 140. The total funding for five CAMP projects was $1,200,000. The average cost per CAMP participant was $3,038.

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available. However, an evaluation of the program was begun in FY 1985 and results will be available in FY 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1983. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

California State University began an evaluation of HEP and CAMP in FY 1985. The study attempts to examine the economic and social impact of HEP and CAMP on program participants.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies : James J. English, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. Includes a $750,000 supplemental appropriation for CAMP.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ARTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$20,000,000	$3,150,000
1982	3,150,000	2,025,000
1983	1/	2,025,000
1984	1/	2,125,000
1985	1/	3,157,000

Purpose: To conduct demonstration programs regarding the involvement of handicapped people in all the arts; to foster greater awareness of the need for arts programs for the handicapped; to sponsor model programs in the performing arts for children and youth; and to support a national network of State arts and education committees.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The Department's principal objective for FY 1985 was to award noncompetitive grants in a timely manner to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, and to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department made both awards as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Program records (E.1) show that in FY 1984 the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped (NCAH) supported 52 Very Special Arts Festival and Training Programs and 411 Very Special Arts Festivals. NCAH also held a national festival, which featured the talents of handicapped people and demonstrated the value of arts instruction and experience for the handicapped. About 650,000 persons participated in the festival.

In FY 1984 the program at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts helped support the following:

- The American College Theater Festival
- The Alliance for Arts Education
- The Program for Children and Youth.

These programs reached approximately 3.5 million students, parents, and teachers through workshops, seminars, and performances, including 25 Imagination Celebrations.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

In May 1984, 750 students representing all 50 states participated in festivities celebrating the 10th anniversary of NCAH at the Kennedy Center.

The Kennedy Center also was the setting for the 16th National American College Theater Festival in April 1984, at which finalists from colleges and universities performed. The Kennedy Center also held a National Children's Art Festival featuring two plays, Clementina's Cactus and The Trip, based on children's books.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Performance Reports, Program Files, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ann Mack, (202) 472-7080

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Arts in Education program of $2,025,000.

INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$11,000,000	$5,850,000
1982	1/	5,850,000
1983	1/	5,850,000
1984	1/	6,500,000 2/
1985	1/	7,000,000 2/

Purpose: To support the distribution of inexpensive books to students from preschool through high school age, to encourage them to learn to read.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The Department's principal objective for FY 1985 was to award the contract to Reading is Fundamental (RIF), Inc., in a timely manner.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded the contract to RIF, Inc., as scheduled but at a lower amount than was planned. 2/

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985 more than 2.2 million children were provided nearly 7.1 million books by 3,078 local projects. (E.1)

Program Effectiveness: According to reports from local projects (E.1), teachers and parents have observed that children have greater interest in and spend more time reading. Some also report increased use of the school and public libraries by participating children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D. Highlights of Activities

RIF held an "In Celebration of Reading Program" to encourage children to read for pleasure. More than a million children and their parents participated. At the end of the 2-week program, the children had cumulatively spent the equivalent of 285 years in reading.

All projects held special activities during Reading Is Fun Week. In Washington, D.C., the National RIF Reader was honored.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Reports of RIF, Inc., Program Files, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carrolyn Andrews, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program of $5,850,000.

2. In fiscal year 1985, Congress appropriated $7 million for this program. A portion of this appropriation, $650,000, was used to support the FY 1984 project that had not received all of its funding because of the Federal District Court's impoundment of fiscal year 1984 funds in United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago. When the Federal District Court releases the frozen FY 1984 funds, accounting adjustments will be made to bring the program up to its full funding level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LAW-RELATED EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.123)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, Section 583, P.L. 97-35, as amended by P.L. 98-312 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	1/	$1,000,000
1984	1/	1,000,000
1985	1/	2,000,000

Purpose: To enable nonlawyers, including children, youth, and adults, to be better informed concerning the law, the legal process, the legal system, and the fundamental principles on which these are based.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide assistance from established law-related education programs to other State education agencies (SEA) and local education agencies (LEA), to enable them to instituionalize successful law-related education programs;
- To support projects to develop, demonstrate, and disseminate new approaches or techniques in law-related education that can be used or adapted and eventually institutionalized by other agencies and institutions; and
- To support a contract for specific activities in law-related education outside the grant competition.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985, $2 million supported 30 law-related education projects, including the following:

- One national project designed to establish networks, develop outreach contact centers, conduct workshops, and identify institutionalization teams to work with LEAs in seven States;
- Twenty statewide projects;

- o Three regional and five systemwide projects; and
- o One contract to film the activities of the Supreme Court.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Many changes have taken place in law-related education since it was first funded in FY 1980 (E.1). At that time, a grant supported one or two schools within an LEA. Now, a grant can serve an entire State through an emphasis on forming partnerships. A substantial amount of in-kind support is contributed, particularly through volunteer professionals in the private sector. The national program has a network of 21 bar associations across the Nation.

With the exception of three grantees, programs are being implemented by consortia or collaborative partnerships; thousands of students (K-12) and adults participate in such projects.

Law-related education uses a variety of learning approaches such as mock trials with volunteer trial judges presiding for high school students, and discussions about legal issues appearing in "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" for first graders. Law-related education covers a wide range of subjects such as fundamental legal principles and the values on which they are based; the Bill of Rights and other constitutional law; the role and limits of law in a democratic society both past and present; the Federal, State, and local lawmaking process; the role of law in avoiding and resolving conflicts; the administration of the criminal, civil, and juvenile justice systems; and issues of authority, freedom, enforcement, and punishment.

Program Effectiveness: A 3-year research study on the impact of law-related education activities on students was completed in 1984 (E.2). It was the second national study of the effectiveness of law-related education activities and was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, with partial support from the Education Department. The study, published in 1984, confirmed previous findings that law-related education, when taught according to specific, identifiable standards, can serve as a significant deterrent to delinquent behavior.

The evaluation found that students who are exposed to law-related education are less likely than others the same age to engage in 8 of the 10 categories of delinquent behavior examined. For students participating in law-related education, rates dropped for offenses ranging from truancy and cheating on tests to smoking marijuana and acts usually classified as felonies. These students also showed improvement in many factors associated with law-abiding behavior, including favorable attitudes toward school and the police and avoidance of delinquent friends.

D. Highlights of Activities

- The first analysis of law-related education funding (FY 1980-84) was completed; it showed an increase of support for projects of larger scale and greater involvement in proposed activities by the private sector.
- The first Internal Control Review of Federal program administration was conducted at the direction of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This review examined a number of areas including delegation of authority, organizational checks and balances, policies and procedures, and budgeting and reporting procedures. The primary strength was found to be the highly qualified program staff; the primary weakness was delays in clearance processes caused by external offices.
- Planning was undertaken for a National Conference on Correctional Education scheduled for FY 1986.
- The first law-related education manual was developed.
- The first simplified and uniform performance report format was developed and approved by OMB.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
2. "Law-Related Education Evaluation Project Final Report, Phase II, Year 3," Social Science Education Consortium and Center for Action Research, Boulder, Colorado, June 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress. Research on law-related education is being carried out at the University of Colorado but is not supported by this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: M. Patricia Goins, (202) 472-7960

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Law-Related Education Program of $1 million.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE STATE GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA 84.164)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act of 1984, Title II, P.L. 98-377, (20 U.S.C. 3961 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	$350,000,000	0
1985	400,000,000	$100,000,000 1/

Purpose: To make financial assistance available to States to improve teachers' skills and instruction in mathematics, science, computer learning, and foreign languages and to increase the access of all students to such instruction.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

'uring FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as ollows:

- To publish regulations for the program of formula grants to States;
- To provide initial technical assistance to State Title II coordinators about program administration; and
- To receive State applications, approve applications meeting legal requirements, and issue grant awards.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department published final regulations on October 25, 1985.
- The Department sponsored national Title II workshops (December 1984 and January 1985) to provide State Coordinators with information about the legislation and the Title II application requirements.
- The Department approved applications from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and issued all grant awards before October 1, 1985. The Insular Areas included Title II in their consolidated grant applications, which were also approved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The 106 grant awards (two per State, one for elementary and secondary education, one for higher education) ranged from a combined State total of $8,648,231 (California) to $445,500 (the 14 States receiving the statutorily mandated minimum allocation). Within States, 70 percent of funds must be used for elementary and secondary education and 30 percent for higher education.

Program Effectiveness: Because grants to States under this program were first made during the summer of 1985, no information on program results or effectiveness is available yet.

D. Highlights of Activities

- The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education has cooperated with the Council of the Chief State School Officers and the National Science Foundation in the development of a model State needs assessment instrument. This effort will also result in a profile of the condition of education in mathematics, science, computer education, and foreign languages.
- A directory of key State and national contact persons for Title II programs was published and distributed to State offices.
- Work on a nonregulatory guidance packet was begun.

. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Department has approved the use of $500,000 from the FY 1985 appropriation for the Title II Secretary's Discretionary Fund for program evaluation activities. Preliminary planning for a study of this program is under way. Information on the nature of the work to be done will be included in next year's chapter. Evaluation findings will be available in FY 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Allen Schmieder, (202) 755-0410

Program Studies : Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. Of this amount, $9,900,900 is reserved for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund, which includes (1) a program of research, evaluation, and demonstration programs and (2) a program for improvement of education in critical foreign languages, which is administered by the Office of Postsecondary Education.

MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.165)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act of 1984, Title VII, P.L. 98-377 (20 U.S.C. 4051-4062) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$75,000,000	$75,000,000

Purposes: To provide financial assistance to eligible local education agencies (LEAs) to enable them (1) to establish and operate magnet schools; (2) to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority-group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools; (3) to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority-group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority-group students; and (4) to encourage the development of courses of instruction within magnet schools that will substantially strengthen the knowledge of academic subjects and marketable vocational skills of students attending these schools.

Grants are awarded to eligible LEAs for use in magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan and that are designed to bring together students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. In considering LEA applications, the Department gives special attention to how recently the LEA has implemented the approved desegregation plan; the proportion of minority-group children involved in the approved desegregation plan; the LEA's need for assistance; and the degree to which the program affords promise of achieving the purposes of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. The maximum amount of funds any LEA may receive during the fiscal year is $4 million.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The objectives of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program are to enable LEAs to establish and operate programs in magnet schools by (1) providing assistance to develop and offer courses of academic instruction; (2) providing courses designed to increase the marketable skills of secondary and vocational school students; (3) purchasing books and materials that contribute to academic excellence; and (4) providing payment for secondary school teachers in magnet schools and for the planning of a magnet school program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985, 44 awards (out of 125 applications) were made in 21 States. Award amounts ranged from $214,000 to $4 million. Four LEAs received $4 million, and 9 received awards above $3 million.

C. Costs and Benefits

Since the Magnet Schools Assistance grants were awarded only in FY 1985, no information is available on the effectiveness of the program.

D. and E.

No information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: M. Patricia Goins, (202) 472-7960.

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

BILINGUAL EDUCATION--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by P.L. 98-511; 20 U.S.C. 3221-3262 (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$139,970,000 1/	$161,427,000
1982	139,970,000	138,058,000
1983	139,970,000	138,057,000
1984	139,970,000	135,679,000
1985	176,000,000 2/	139,265,000

Purposes: To develop and support instructional programs of English proficiency for students with limited English proficiency (LEP); to assist financially the educational agencies that conduct these programs; and to assist financially the research, development, training and technical assistance activities that enhance the delivery of such instructional programs.

Program Components

The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs administers Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act programs. This chapter describes programs that provide discretionary grants to local education agencies (LEAs) and, in some cases, to other agencies. These grants are designed to help these agencies develop and conduct instructional programs for LEP students.

1. Transitional Bilingual Education. A program of structured English-language instruction and, to the extent necessary, instruction in the native language of the child incorporating the cultural heritage of the child, which is designed to allow the child to achieve competence in English and to meet grade-promotion and graduation standards.

2. Developmental Bilingual Education. A full-time program of instruction in a second language and of structured English language instruction, which is designed to help children achieve competence both in English and in a non-English language while mastering subject matter skills and meeting grade-promotion and graduation standards.

3. Special Alternative Instruction. A program that is designed to provide structured English language instruction and special instructional services (not including instruction in the non-English language, except for clarification purposes) and to enable children to achieve competence in English and to meet grade-promotion and graduation standards.

4. Academic Excellence. A program that facilitates the dissemination of model programs of transitional or developmental bilingual education or special alternative instruction.

5. Family English Literacy. A program of instruction that is designed to help LEP adults and out-of-school youths achieve competence in English; the material may be taught either entirely in English or in English and the students' native language. The law prescribes a preference for serving families of students enrolled in one of the other subprograms.

6. Special Populations Program. Programs of instruction that are designed for LEP preschool, special education, and gifted and talented students; these programs are preparatory or supplementary to other programs assisted under Title VII.

7. Program for the Development of Instructional Materials. Programs that assist the development of instructional materials in languages that are not commercially available. These instructional materials must meet the needs of LEAs that offer programs such as those assisted under Title VII.

Eligibility

Applicant Eligibility: For Transitional, Developmental, Special Alternative, and Academic Excellence programs, an LEA may apply alone, jointly with other LEAs, or jointly with institutions of higher education. For Family English Literacy and Special Populations programs, LEAs, institutions of higher education, or private nonprofit organizations are eligible.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Students with limited proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing English; up to 40 percent of the beneficiaries in transitional programs may be proficient in English, and up to 50 percent of the beneficiaries in developmental programs may be proficient. Students in both public and nonprofit, private elementary and secondary schools may receive services.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

o To encourage LEAs to plan, develop, and implement flexible and imaginative educational approaches in order to best serve their LEP student populations, and

o To increase the capacity of LEAs to sustain instructional programs for LEP students when Federal funding ends.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o In FY 1985, 538 transitional bilingual education grants were awarded to districts to serve about 174,500 LEP students. More than 90 different languages are spoken by these students. Approximately 30 percent of the projects served fewer than 200 students each, 34 percent served

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

between 200 and 399 students each, and 36 percent served 400 or more students each.

- Two developmental bilingual education grants were awarded to implement bilingual programs in Spanish in New York City for 550 students and for approximately 100 students to be instructed in the Sioux language in South Dakota.
- Most of the 36 Special Alternative Instructional Programs funded represented variations on English-as-a-second-language programs.
- Funds expended for the academic excellence program were to continue projects initially funded under the Demonstration Projects Program of the old law.
- Four projects under the Family Literacy Program were funded. The grants will provide services to approximately 497 LEP parents and out-of-school youth.
- The Special Populations Programs funded 28 projects serving all categories of special populations.
- Two Materials Development Projects were funded to develop computer software in social studies, math, and science for LEP students in grades 3 through 5 who come to school with Spanish as their first language; and instructional materials that focus on social studies for Crow Indian students, grades 4 through 6.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope:

Program Components	Number of Awards	Number of Proposals Received	Total Funds for Awards
Transitional Bilingual	538	751	$78,569,133
Developmental Bilingual	2	11	242,126
Special Alternative	36	104	5,267,092
Academic Excellence	37	38	6,166,784
Family English Literacy	4	50	496,534
Special Populations	28	85	3,428,848
Instructional Materials	2	18	239,731
Total	647	1,057	$94,410,248

Coverage of Students in Need. Almost all (97 percent) of the public school districts that enroll significant numbers of LEP students provided special instruction for them. Almost all LEP students in these schools (94 percent) received some kind of special services (see E. 1).

According to local school estimates, there were approximately 1.3 million LEP students in public schools grades K through 12 as of 1984; 882,000 of them were in grades K through 6. Most LEP students--55 percent of the total, 64 percent of Hispanics--were born in the United States. Only 15 percent of third-grade LEP students had received any education outside the United States (see E. 1).

Role of the Non-English Language

Fifteen percent of all districts reported that one of their goals was to maintain and improve proficiency in the non-English language (see E. 1). Spanish was the most common non-English language in 63 percent of the schools. Seventy-eight percent of the LEP students were of Spanish-speaking background. The typical program in schools where Spanish was the most common non-English language combined continued use of Spanish with English-language instruction. In schools where Spanish was not the most common non-English language, 91 percent used all-English instructional programs (see E. 1).

Spanish-speaking LEP students, when compared with LEP students from other language backgrounds, received more instructional time in the non-English language and in ethnic heritage studies and less instructional time in English, math, and science (see E. 1).

The more affluent the neighborhood, the less likely the school was to use the non-English language in instruction (see E. 1).

Language Services in the Outlying Territories. Almost all public school students in the Outlying Territories are classified as LEP. On some islands, there are no native English-speaking school-age children. On other islands, English is a major, if not the dominant, language. English is now the first language of one-third of the Guam population. In the late 1960s, some native Guamanians became concerned about the rate at which English was replacing Chamorro among the island's youths, and, in 1970, initiated the first Title VII project whose main focus was instruction in Chamorro. One consequence of these activities was the passage of a law in 1977 requiring all residents of Guam to learn Chamorro (less than half the Island's population is native Chamorro-speaking) (see E. 1).

In Puerto Rico, Title VII focuses on teaching Spanish to approximately 10 percent of the school population who have returned to Puerto Rico from the mainland and are deficient in Spanish, the island's official language (see E. 3).

Is one instructional method best for all students? One study found extensive differences in what was effective instruction for Chinese and Mexican-American students. It concluded that "instructional practices and settings work differently for different groups of students. The kinds of settings that favor Chinese students may inhibit learning for Hispanic students" (see E. 3).

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

- New legislation made provisions for the funding of alternatives to transitional bilingual education by Title VII.
- Legislation limited the funding of alternatives to transitional bilingual education to between 4 and 10 percent of the appropriated funds.
- For the first time, legislation created a program category of maintenance of the home language rather than transitional bilingual education.
- Authority over research and evaluation in bilingual education was removed from the Secretary and delegated to the Director of the program.
- Final regulations for the program will be available in FY 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "The Descriptive Phase Report of the National Longitudinal Evaluation," Development Associates, Arlington, Virginia, 1984 (Contract 300-83-0300).
2. "Special Services for Language Minority Limited English Proficient Students in the Outlying Territories of the United States," Rudes, B., and Cardenas, R. Development Associates, Arlington, Virginia, 1984 (Contract 300-83-0030).
3. "Learning English Through Bilingual Education," Wong-Filmore, L.; Ammon, P., McLaughlin, B.; and Ammon, M.S., University of California, Berkeley, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Development Associates, which issued the Descriptive Phase Report of its National Longitudinal Evaluation, is scheduled to issue other phases in future years.

SRA Technologies, Incorporated, of Mountain View, California, is conducting a longitudinal study of immersion and dual-language instructional programs.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:	Rudy Cordova, (202) 245-2609--Transitional Bilingual Education, Special Alternative Instruction, and Development Programs
	Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595--Academic Excellence, Special Populations, and Family English Literacy Program
	Edward Fuentes, (202) 245-2600--Research and Evaluation
Program Studies :	Keith Baker, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.
2. The Bilingual Education Act of 1984 reauthorized Title VII at this funding level indefinitely.

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.146) 1/

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Refugee Act of 1980, P.L. 96-212, Section 412 (8 U.S.C. 1522); Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, P.L. 97-363 (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 2/
1981................	Indefinite	$44,268,000 3/
1982................	Indefinite	0
1983................	Indefinite	16,600,000
1984................	Indefinite	16,600,000
1985................	Indefinite	16,600,000

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to meet the special education needs of eligible refugee children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. The grants may be used for special curriculum materials, bilingual teachers and aides, remedial classes, and guidance and counseling services required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American education system.

Eligibility: The program provides grants to SEAs to help LEAs provide special services to eligible children. The State must have an approved plan for the administration of refugee resettlement programs on file with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Administration: The program is administered by the Department of Education via an interagency agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

Other than following the annual formula grant procedures, no new goals or objectives for FY 1985 were identified for this program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: Not applicable.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: For school year 1985-86, $16,600,000 of FY 1985 funds were used for the education of refugee children; 82,174 children were served for an average of $202 per child. The Secretary determines the amounts of the awards to SEAs based on a count of the eligible children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the States. For each year in which funds are made available for this program, the Secretary announces a date when SEAs must count the children eligible for assistance. Some SEAs and LEAs may have difficulty in arriving at accurate counts because identification of children eligible for assistance involves privacy issues, which in some cases are governed by State and local law.

Geographic Distribution: For school year 1985-86, the States reported that there were 82,174 eligible refugee children enrolled in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. California alone accounted for almost 35 percent of the total refugee enrollment.

Enrollment Decrease: Between school years 1984-85 and 1985-86, total enrollment of refugee children decreased by approximately 13 percent because of a slowdown in refugee resettlement.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D., E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Not applicable.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 732-1842

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. During fiscal years 1980 through 1984, Congress also made special appropriations to meet the special educational needs of the Cuban and Haitian entrant children. The Secretary of Education requested and received a FY 1980 appropriation of $7.7 million under Section 303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended. Funding for Cuban and Haitian entrants for FY 1981 ($6 million), FY 1982 ($5.7 million), FY 1983 ($5 million) and FY 1984 ($5 million) was made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended. Appropriation language limited eligibility for FY 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984 funds to LEAs with at least 10,000 entrants enrolled. Only Dade County, Florida, qualified. In FY 1985,

the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) instead of transferring the $5 million for Cuban and Haitian entrant children to the Department of Education, awarded a grant directly to the Dade County School District.

2. Appropriations under this authority were made to DHHS and then transferred to the Department of Education. These appropriations do not include funds for Cuban and Haitian entrants made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended.

3. Appropriations made in FY 1981 were used for a 2-year period.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by P.L. 98-511 (20 U.S.C. 3221-3262) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$139,970,000 1/	$161,427,000
1982	139,970,000	138,058,000
1983	139,970,000	138,057,000
1984	139,970,000	135,679,000
1985	176,000,000 2/	139,265,000

Purpose: To develop the human resources necessary to carry out bilingual education programs (see Chapter 201).

Program Components

1. Fellowships. The program provides at least 500 fellowships for graduate study in bilingual education, teaching, training, and administration. Recipients either repay their fellowships or work in an area related to the purposes of the bilingual education program.

2. Training Projects. This program provides financial assistance to establish, operate, or improve programs to train teachers and administrators, paraprofessionals, parents, and other support personnel participating or preparing to participate in bilingual education programs. Two types of projects are funded under this program:

- Projects that provide undergraduate and graduate degree-related training and develop and improve training programs at institutions of higher education; and

- Projects that provide nondegree training to improve the skills of parents and educational personnel participating in programs of bilingual education or in special alternative instructional programs.

3. Schools of Education Projects. This program provides financial assistance to institutions of higher education to develop or expand their capacity to provide degree-granting bilingual education training programs. Funds are used to pay salaries to instructors in bilingual education; the Federal share of costs declines over the 3-year grant.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

To strengthen the capacity of State and local education agencies to conduct and maintain instructional programs for students with limited English proficiency by developing a solid core of trained educators.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985, grants and contracts were made to training organizations to continue and to intensify training efforts for future and current teachers and for other educational personnel.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Program Components		Actual Appropriation
Graduate/Undergraduate		$15,984,824
Number of Programs	148	
Fellowships		4,666,086
Number of Fellows	514	
Number of Projects	37	
Grants to Schools of Education		164,467
Number of Programs	8	
Training Institutes		2,178,363
Number of Programs	12	
Total Cost		$22,933,940

Program Effectiveness

Schools of Education Program (also called Dean's Grant Projects). In January 1985, a contractor conducted a study of the first 27 Dean's Grant projects funded for the first time in 1980. It was found that 25 projects completed the entire 3-year project period as proposed. Twenty-four projects institutionalized their programs and were found to have been successful in meeting the intent of the legislation. Two projects were terminated at the end of the second year because of a lack of institutional commitment on the part of the institution and noncompliance with program regulations (see E. 1).

Of the 25 projects that completed the 3-year project period, all but 4 projects accomplished their original objectives as approved. One institution failed to accomplish its objective of establishing a new

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

bilingual education program within the university. Three institutions that were implementing Dean's Grant projects modified their original objectives and were able to fulfill the intent of the Dean's Grant Project by developing a bilingual education training program of a different degree level or of a field of study different from that which was originally proposed. These training programs are now institutionalized at each of these universities.

The major objective of the program was to establish a teacher training program or to expand or improve an existing program. New programs were established by 13 projects; 4 projects expanded their programs to include new language groups; 11 projects integrated bilingual education into the general teacher education curriculum; and 11 projects integrated their training program in bilingual education with their special education curriculum. In addition, the study found that final reports submitted by the projects lacked essential information requested by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs; project administrators (limited to Deans of the school of education within the university) spoke highly of the goals and of the program management and of the efficient use of Federal funds.

One area of concern cited in the study was the need to review the quality of teaching English-as-a-second-language methodology in the bilingual education training programs. Another concern was the problem of recruiting students for the program (see E. 1).

Need for Teachers. Several studies have attempted to estimate the supply and demand of teachers trained to meet the special educational needs of bilingual students. Estimates of the numbers of such teachers needed range from 48,700 to 102,900 (see E. 2). However, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that, in 1983, the public schools reported only 29,900 bilingual teacher positions (see E. 3). Estimates of the shortage of bilingual teachers range from 260 (see E. 3) to 86,200 (see E. 2). Although the NCES data indicate a very small shortage of bilingual teachers nationwide, severe local shortages may still exist.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Cumulative Activities Carried Out by Grantees and Other Institutions of Higher Education Which Have Operated Dean's Grant Programs." Ebel, C. (No. 403347400657), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1985.

2. "The Availability of Bilingual Education Teachers." Reisner, E.R. in Baker, K., and de Kanter, A. (eds.) Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy. Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1983.

3. Edstats, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1985. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

In FY 1983, Arawak Consulting Corporation was awarded a procurement to examine inservice training. In FY 1986, a major evaluation of the training programs will be undertaken.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595

Program Studies : Keith Baker, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.
2. The Bilingual Education Act of 1984 reauthorized Title VII at this funding level indefinitely.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES
(CFDA No. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by P.L. 98-511 (20 U.S.C. 3221-3262) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$139,970,000 1/	$161,427,000
1982	139,970,000	138,058,000
1983	139,970,000	138,057,000
1984	139,970,000	135,679,000
1985	176,000,000 2/	139,265,000

Purpose: To develop resources in curriculum, technical assistance, instructional materials, demographic data, evaluation procedures, and research that enhance the ability of educational agencies to develop and conduct instructional programs for students with limited English proficiency (LEP).

Program Components

1. State Programs provide data on each State's population of LEP persons and on the services available to them. The programs provide or develop bilingual education programs; provide or supervise technical assistance to local schools; develop and administer assessment procedures; and provide staff training and capacity-building activities.

2. Evaluation Assistance Centers provide technical assistance to bilingual education projects for assessing the educational progress of the students in the programs and for identifying the educational needs and competencies of LEP students. The Evaluation Assistance Centers also collect and synthesize information on program evaluation strategies and apply this information in technical assistance strategies.

3. Multifunctional Resource Centers provide technical assistance and training to educational agencies that are instructing LEP students.

4. The Research and Development Program authorizes the following activities:

- o Collection, analysis, and dissemination of information on bilingual education and related programs by the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education;
- o Studies to determine and evaluate effective models for bilingual education programs;

- Examination of the process by which students acquire a second language and master the subject-matter skills required for grade-promotion and graduation, and identify effective methods for teaching English and subject-matter skills within the context of a bilingual education program or special alternative instructional program to students who have language proficiencies other than English;
- Longitudinal studies to measure the effect of Title VII on the education of students who have language proficiencies other than English, and the effect of Title VII on the capacity of local education agencies (LEAs) to operate bilingual programs following the termination of Federal assistance;
- Studies to determine effective and reliable methods for identifying students who are entitled to services and for determining when their English-language proficiency is sufficiently well developed to permit them to derive optimal benefits from an all-English instructional program;
- Studies to determine effective methods of teaching English to adults who are proficient in a language other than English;
- Studies to determine and evaluate effective methods of instruction for bilingual programs, taking into account language and cultural differences among students; and
- Studies to determine effective approaches to preservice and inservice training for teachers, taking into account the language and cultural differences of their students.

Eligibility

1. State Programs. Only State education agencies (SEAs) are eligible for assistance.

2. Evaluation Assistance Centers. Only institutions of higher education are eligible for assistance.

3. Multifunctional Service Centers. Those eligible include (1) institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and community colleges and private, nonprofit organizations) which apply, after consultation with, or jointly with, one or more LEAs or an SEA; (2) LEAs; and (3) SEAs.

4. Research and Development Program. Awards under this program are made by grant and contract on a competitive basis. Eligible applicants include institutions of higher education, private and nonprofit organizations, SEAs and individuals.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

To stimulate the development of a variety of resources to serve the needs of personnel in bilingual education and special alternative instructional programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope:

Program Components	Number of Awards	Amount
State Programs	49	$4,999,716
Evaluation Assistance Centers	1	250,000
Multifunctional Resource Centers	16	8,882,633
National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education	1	1,200,000
Research program	19	3,600,000
Total	76	$18,923,349

1. State Programs

Program Scope: The legislation limited SEAs to an award amount of 5 percent or less of the total Federal bilingual funds going for State program grants. However, no State will receive less than $50,000. Forty-nine projects with a total expenditure approaching $5 million were served by this program in FY 1985.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

2. Evaluation Assistance Centers

Program Scope: The legislation requires at least two evaluation assistance centers be established through competitive grants to institutions of higher education. One center was funded in FY 1985 at a total cost of $250,000.

Program Effectiveness

No information.

3. Multifunctional Service Centers

Program Scope: In FY 1985, 16 centers received a total of almost $9 million in Federal funds.

Program Effectiveness

No information.

4. Research and Development Program

Program Scope: The Department awarded $3.6 million for research and evaluation studies and evaluations. Another $1.2 million was budgeted to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

- The new law established an office within the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs which is exclusively responsible for the collection, aggregation, analysis, and publication of data and information on the operation and effectiveness of programs assisted under Title VII.
- New regulations were promulgated for the support services program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

In FY 1985, the following contracts were awarded:

- A Special Issues Analysis Center was awarded to the COMSIS Corporation. The objectives of the Special Issues Analysis Center are to review and synthesize information on Title VII applicants and grantees. The center will also review and synthesize information on the general LEP population in the United States.
- A survey of language-minority parents' attitudes toward their children's educational program was awarded to the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey.
- A study to devise and test evaluation models for bilingual education programs was awarded to SRA Technologies in Mountain View, California.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rudy Cordova, (202) 245-2609--State Education Agency Program

Edward Fuentes, (202) 245-2600--Research, Evaluation Assistance Centers, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Multifunctional Centers

Program Studies : Keith Baker, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.
2. The Bilingual Education Act of 1984 reauthorized Title VII at this funding level indefinitely.

EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM
(CFDA 84.162)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 98-511, Title VI of the Education Amendments of 1984 (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	0 1/	$30,000,000
1985	$30,000,000	$30,000,000

Purpose: This program provides financial assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) for supplementary education services and costs for immigrant children enrolled in elementary and secondary public and nonpublic schools.

Eligible Recipients: States are eligible for grants under the Emergency Immigrant Education program. Assistance will be distributed among the eligible LEAs within the State on the basis of the number of immigrant children enrolled in its public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. Eligible LEAs are those in which at least 500 eligible immigrant children are enrolled or the number of eligible immigrant children enrolled constitutes at least 3 percent of its total enrollment.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

To reimburse States for the funds expended by them for the proper and efficient administration of educational services to immigrant children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984 passed both houses of Congress and became an authorized program in FY 1985 as part of the Education Amendments of 1984. Funds can now be legally appropriated under this Act.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Costs: In FY 1985, $3 million was awarded through grants to 31 SEAs and Puerto Rico. The distribution of grant awards fell into the following categories: 9 grants were under $100,000; 15 grants were between $100,000 to $500,000; 4 awards were between $500,000 and $1 million; and 4 awards were for $1 million or more. For the 1985-86 school year, the Emergency Immigrant Education Program will spend approximately $71 per immigrant child, a decrease of $15 from last year. The decrease will occur because more States are applying for funding.

Students Served: The Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance appropriation serves more than 422,500 immigrant students in 31 States and Puerto Rico during the school year 1985-86.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D., E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Not applicable.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 732-1842

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. The U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 3520 in FY 1984 authorizing this legislation. The Senate never passed a comparable bill. As a result, although an appropriation was made in FY 1984, the program was never authorized.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

AID TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN STATE-OPERATED AND STATE-SUPPORTED SCHOOLS (CFDA No. 84.009)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) Chapter I, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3801-3807) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$165,000,000	$156,625,000
1982	171,092,000	146,520,000
1983	146,520,000	146,520,000
1984	146,520,000	146,520,000
1985	150,170,000	150,170,000

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State agencies that are directly responsible for providing free public education to handicapped children.

Restrictions on Use of Funds: State agencies are authorized to use these funds only for programs and projects that are designed to meet the special education and related service needs of handicapped children. Handicap categories include mental retardation, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf-blind, specific learning disabilities, multihandicapped, and other health impairments requiring special education.

Formula: Each State's share is determined by a statutory formula. This formula is based on the number of eligible handicapped children counted in average daily attendance, multiplied by 40 percent of the average State per-pupil expenditure (but not less than 80 percent, or more than 120 percent, of the national per pupil expenditure). The amount for each State is reduced in proportion to the appropriation available for distribution.

Eligible Children: Handicapped children in State-operated or State-supported programs are eligible. Handicapped children in local education agencies (LEAs) are eligible if the following statutory conditions are met:

- The child leaves an eligible educational program operated or supported by a State agency to participate in a program in the LEA;
- The child continues to receive an appropriately designed special educational program in the LEA; and
- The State agency transfers to the LEA an amount equal to the sums the State agency receives for the children.

Administration: This is a State-administered program. Applications for project funds are submitted by eligible State-operated or State-supported schools and LEAs to the State education agency (SEA) for approval.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417 (a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to continue financial assistance to States to help them provide services to eligible handicapped children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The children served through the program tend to be more severely handicapped than children supported under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Under the program discussed here, the State obtained a higher Federal contribution per child than was possible under the Part B program in FY 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Funding in FY 1985 provided services for 249,245 children, an increase of 1,954 over the number in 1984. Federal per pupil contribution averaged $602 in FY 1985. Children benefiting under the program in academic year 1984-85 were distributed across the following categories: Mentally Retarded, 95,108; Deaf-Blind, 1,005; Orthopedically Impaired, 11,324; Other Health Impaired, 7,269; Visually Handicapped, 9,493; Speech-Impaired, 18,704; Specific Learning Disabled, 23,018; Hard of Hearing and Deaf, 22,808; Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, 42,799; and Multihandicapped, 17,717 (E.1).

State Administration: Procedures in SEAs emphasize the total special education program and ensure systematic monitoring of providers for compliance with State and Federal requirements, including the procedures for ensuring fulfillment of the P.L. 93-380 LEA transfer provisions. Fiscal accountability is maintained in most States by more than one State agency, with at least one being the SEA. (E.2)

Program Effectiveness: No new information. (See FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.

2. Federal Direction Needed for Educating Handicapped Children in State Schools, General Accounting Office, March 1978.

3. Assessment of Educational Programs in State Supported and State Operated Schools, Rehab Group, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia, September 1979.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417 (b)]

An assessment of the Chapter 1 grants program for the handicapped began in late FY 1984. This study will describe the operation of the Chapter I program for handicapped children in nine States and will assess the feasibility of the Department of Education's conducting a large-scale national evaluation of the program. Results are due in FY 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Tyrrell, (202) 732-1014

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

HANDICAPPED SCHOOL PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.027)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 94-142, (20 U.S.C. 1411-1420) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	1/	$ 874,500,000
1982	$ 969,850,000 2/	931,008,000
1983	1,017,900,000 2/	1,017,900,000
1984	1,068,875,000 2/	1,068,900,000
1985	Indefinite	1,135,145,000

Purpose: To help States make available a free, appropriate public education for all handicapped children. The program awards grants to States to help State and local education agencies pay for special education and related services to handicapped children ages 3 through 21. These services must be provided in the least restrictive environment and in accordance with an individualized education program that meets each child's unique educational needs. The law also establishes due process safeguards to provide a mechanism to resolve disagreements between parents of handicapped children and public agencies responsible for providing a free, appropriate education to these children.

Formula: Funds for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allocated on the basis of a certified count of the number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services on December 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is made.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The two objectives of the program are designed to enforce compliance with the law:

- To increase services to underserved handicapped children, and
- To assure effective implementation of the program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The number of preschool-age handicapped children who were served increased by almost 7 percent from school year 1983-84 to 1984-85. During the same period, the number of handicapped young people ages 18 through 21 who were served increased by 4 percent.

- During monitoring visits completed this year, Department personnel identified and resolved issues involving procedural safeguards, such as inconsistency in administrative processes, educational environment, monitoring, and general supervision.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: Since the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), the number of children served has continued to grow. In academic year 1976-77, 3,485,000 children ages 3 through 21 (less than 8 percent of all children) were served, compared with 4,118,000 (almost 11 percent) in academic year 1984-85.

There have been notable changes in the numbers and percentages of children with certain handicapping conditions who have received special education and related services between 1976-77 and 1984-85. The numbers of students receiving services who are visually handicapped, orthopedically impaired, hard of hearing and deaf, or who have other health impairments, have decreased dramatically. The numbers of students who are mentally retarded or who have speech-impairments also have decreased. In contrast, the number of students who are classified as learning disabled has more than doubled; in academic year 1984-85, more than two-fifths of the handicapped students served fell into this category.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN SERVED, BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION, ACADEMIC YEARS 1984-85 AND 1976-77

Handicapping Condition	Academic Year			
	1984-85		1976-77	
	Children Ages 3-21 Served by Program		Children Ages 3-21 Served by Program	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Learning Disabled	1,818,000	44	797,000	23
Speech Impaired	1,112,000	27	1,303,000	37
Mentally Retarded	624,000	15	838,000	24
Emotionally Disturbed	330,000	8	253,000	7
Other Health Impaired	62,000	2	125,000	4
Multihandicapped	54,000	1	NA	
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	48,000	1	62,000	2
Orthopedically Impaired	48,000	1	79,000	2
Visually Handicapped	21,000	1	28,000	1
Deaf-Blind	1,000	0	NA	
Total	4,118,000	100	3,485,000	100

SOURCE: E.1 and E.2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

CHILDREN SERVED, BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION, AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT ACADEMIC YEARS 1984-85 and 1976-77

Handicapping Condition	Academic Year*	
	1984-85	1976-77
Learning Disabled	4.7	1.8
Speech Impaired	2.9	2.9
Mentally Retarded	1.6	1.9
Emotionally Disturbed	0.9	0.6
Other Health-Impaired	0.2	0.3
Multihandicapped	0.1	NA
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	0.1	0.1
Orthopedically Impaired	0.1	0.2
Visually Handicapped	0.1	0.1
Deaf-Blind	0	NA
Total	10.6	7.7

*Percentage of fall enrollment, prekindergarten through 12th grade.
SOURCE: E.3

The approximate Federal funding share per child also has continued to grow from $72 in FY 1977 to $276 in FY 1985. Table 3 summarizes this trend:

Table 3

FEDERAL FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal Year	Child Count	Funding	Federal Share Per Child
1977	3,485,000	$ 251,796,927	$ 72
1978	3,561,000	566,030,074	159
1979	3,700,000	804,000,000	217
1980	3,803,000	874,500,000	230
1981	3,941,000	874,500,000	222
1982	3,990,000	931,008,000	233
1983	4,053,000	1,017,900,000	251
1984	4,094,000	1,068,900,000	261
1985	4,118,000	1,135,145,000	276

SOURCE: E.2

D. Highlights of Activities

None at this time.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education of all Handicapped Children Act, 1985, U.S. Department of Education. (Also, see previous Annual Evaluation Reports.)
2. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.
3. The Condition of Education, 1984 edition, U.S. Department of Education.
4. Other studies of this program are supported by the Special Studies Program (Chapter 313).

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

For studies of this program see Chapter 313--Special Studies.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Tyrrell, (202) 732-1014

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. The authorization level was determined by multiplying the number of handicapped children (ages 3 through 21) by 30 percent of average per person expenditures for FY 1981.
2. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (CFDA No. 84.027)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Section 619, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1419) (permanent authorization).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	1/	$25,000,000
1982	$25,000,000	24,000,000
1983	25,000,000	25,000,000
1984	1/	26,330,000
1985	1/	29,000,000

Purpose: To encourage State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to expand educational services to handicapped preschool children from birth through 5 years of age. Grants to States are determined by an annual count of handicapped children ages 3 through 5 who are receiving special education and related services. SEAs may use funds received under this program to provide direct services or they may contract with LEAs, intermediate units, or other agencies to provide such services.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to award grants to encourage States to expand educational programs to handicapped preschool children from birth through age 5.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The FY 1985 appropriation supported 55 grants under this program. Grants went to 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983 expanded the age range of students who can be served with Preschool Incentive Grant funds to birth through age 5 (the program had previously served children ages 3 through 5). As of 1985, 26 States had applied and received approval from the Department to serve children in this age range.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During the 1984-85 school year, 259,000 children received services at an average cost of $112 per child. During the program's first year of operation, 1978, fewer than half of the eligible SEAs chose to participate in the preschool program. Now 55 of 57 eligible agencies are participating. Also, since 1978, funds available have grown from $12,500,000 to $29,000,000.

Preschool Incentive Grant funds are used in numerous ways, depending on State needs. Last year, these funds provided direct and improved special services to preschool handicapped children to develop collaborative interagency agreements, to create statewide networks of technical assistance centers, to provide comprehensive diagnostic assessments, to provide parent training and counseling programs, to train administrative and, ancillary personnel, to begin or expand rural service-delivery programs, and to disseminate information.

Program Effectiveness: The number of handicapped children ages 3 through 5 receiving services has increased from approximately 196,000 in 1978 to 259,000 as reported in the December 1, 1984, child count (see E.1). Despite this progress, a considerable number of eligible handicapped preschool children are not being served, in part because of varying State mandates. Currently, 42 States mandate services to at least some portion of handicapped children 5 years old and younger. However, only 19 require the provision of services to all handicapped children ages 3 through 5, and only 26 are beginning to serve children from birth through age 2 under the Preschool Incentive Grants Program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, January 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Sheila Friedman, (202) 732-1055

Program Studies : Elizabeth Farquhar, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Authorization level for the program is determined by an entitlement formula; each State receives $300 (reduced according to the proportion of funds actually appropriated by Congress) for every handicapped child, age 3 through 5, who is receiving special education and related services.

HANDICAPPED REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS
(CFDA 84.028)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Section 621, Part C, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 (20 U.S.C. 1421) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$24,000,000	$7,656,000
1982	9,800,000	2,880,000
1983	9,800,000	4,130,000
1984	5,700,000	5,700,000
1985	6,000,000	6,000,000

Purpose: To establish regional resource centers to provide advice and technical services to educators for improving the education of handicapped children.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The objectives for each of the seven Regional Resource Centers in FY 1985 were as follows:

- To help States improve their provision of special education and related services to handicapped children and youth;
- To gather and disseminate information to SEAs, LEAs, and relevant projects of the Department of Education;
- To help States develop successful programs for handicapped children and their families, and disseminate information to professionals and parents of handicapped children; and
- To help States solve persistent problems in providing good-quality special education to handicapped children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A total of 450 SEA personnel were trained.
- A total of 700 LEA personnel were trained.

- A total of 2,750 parents of handicapped children were served.
- A total of 300 related-service personnel were trained.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Approximately 4,700 handicapped youngsters are served in demonstration projects.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1982 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in process.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Etta Waugh, (202) 732-1052

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8307

HANDICAPPED INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS -- SERVICES TO DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN AND YOUTH
(CFDA No. 84.025)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicappped Act, Part C, Section 622, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 (20 U.S.C. 1422) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$29,000,000	$16,000,000
1982	16,000,000	15,360,000
1983	16,000,000	15,360,000
1984	15,000,000	15,000,000
1985	15,000,000	15,000,000

Purpose: To support projects enhancing services to deaf-blind children and youth, particularly by providing technical assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and others involved in the education of deaf-blind children and youth.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the program continued to focus on priorities that resulted from legislative amendments in FY 1984.

The Department's first priority is to provide funds to ensure that States will have the capability they need to provide appropriate services to those deaf-blind children for whom they are not required to make available a free, appropriate public education under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act or some other authority.

The Department's second priority for the use of funds is the provision of technical assistance to SEAs. The program also supports demonstration and other projects in areas such as total life planning, changes in State service-delivery systems, communications skills, or the development of social and community skills.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, cooperative agreements, contracts, and grants were made for a period of up to 3 years, as follows:

Priority Area	Approximate Funding Level	Number of Awards
Services for Deaf-Blind Children and Youth	$8,337,000	30
Technical Assistance for Services to Deaf-Blind Youth Upon Attaining the Age of 22	720,000	1
Demonstration and Other Projects	5,943,000	27
Total	$15,000,000	58

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available.

D. and E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Freeman, (202) 732-1165

Program Studies : Elizabeth Farquhar, (202) 245-8877

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.204)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 623, P.L. 91-230 as amended (20 U.S.C. 1423) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$20,000,000	$17,500,000
1982	20,000,000	16,800,000
1983	20,000,000	16,800,000
1984	26,000,000	21,100,000
1985	27,100,000	22,500,000

Purpose: To help eligible agencies develop and implement experimental preschool and early education programs for children from birth through 8 years of age and to help States plan, develop, and implement comprehensive systems that provide special education and related services to handicapped children from birth through 5 years of age.

The program supports five types of contracts and grants:

1. Demonstration grants, to develop service-delivery models based on outstanding practices;

2. Outreach grants, to disseminate model programs and help new sites adopt and implement them;

3. Grants to State agencies, to assist in planning, developing, and providing services to preschool handicapped children from birth through age 5;

4. Special project contracts, to provide support services to other program components; and

5. Research Institute contracts, to conduct long-term research into the problems of young children.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The major change in the Early Childhood Education Program resulting from the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1983 was the increased emphasis on support for State education agencies (SEAs) under the State grants component (formerly State Implementation Grants). For FY 1985, specific objectives for program components were as follows:

- To fund new projects that demonstrate local, State and regional coordination among agencies and serve children from birth to 3 years of age;
- To fund new outreach projects and to encourage grantees to obtain approval from the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP); and
- To fund State planning projects that are comprehensive and include interagency coordination.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985 this program supported the following projects:

Type of Project	New	Continuing	Total
Demonstration	20	82	102
Outreach	24	0	24
State Planning	29	27	56
Special Projects	1	1	2
Research Institutes	0	3	3
Total	74	113	187

Forty-one percent of these projects represent joint efforts by universities, LEAs, SEAs, State agencies, and hospitals. Eleven percent of the outreach projects have received JDRP approval.

Program Effectiveness: No new information.

D. and E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Research institutes will continue to measure the effects of early interventions.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Thomas Finch, (202) 732-1084

Program Studies : Elizabeth Farquhar, (202) 245-8877

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS FOR SEVERELY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.086)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C, Section 624, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 94-142 and 98-199 (20 USC 1424). (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	1/	$4,375,000
1982	$5,000,000	2,880,000
1983	5,000,000	2,880,000
1984	5,000,000	4,000,000
1985	5,300,000	4,300,000

Purpose: To improve and expand innovative educational and training services for severely handicapped children and youths and to improve the acceptance of severely handicapped people by the general public, professionals, and potential employers.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417 (a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department maintained the same priorities established for FY 1984:

- To emphasize placement of handicapped youngsters in the least restrictive environments for services, with special attention to the needs of severely handicapped children and youths; and
- To solicit demonstration projects of innovative services for severely handicapped children and youths.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1985, the Department supported 70 projects, of which 36 were continuing and 44 were new.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: These projects directly served an estimated 3,300 handicapped persons and indirectly served an estimated 1,200 persons; through the projects, about 180 paraprofessionals and professionals were trained to serve handicapped persons.

Program Effectiveness: There are no current data on the effectiveness of these projects. The Department expects to have data in FY 1986 based on information that is currently being collected.

D. Highlights of Activities

Current projects emphasize the following:

- o Deinstitutionalization models,
- o Models to integrate severely handicapped children into attendance centers,
- o Independent living models, and
- o Vocational training models for severely handicapped youth in high-technology fields.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Thompson, (202) 732-1161

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8307

Note

1. No funds were authorized separately for this program. Funding was provided on the basis of the amounts authorized for other Part C activities related to Section 624 activities.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS
(CFDA No. 84.078)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C, Section 625, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C 1424a) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$16,000,000	$2,950,000
1982	4,000,000	2,832,000
1983	4,000,000	2,832,000
1984	5,000,000	5,000,000
1985	5,300,000	5,300,000

Purpose: To develop, operate, and disseminate specially designed model programs of vocational, technical, postsecondary, continuing, or adult education for deaf and other handicapped persons.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the objectives for these programs were as follows:

- To help institutions of higher education develop and operate specially designed programs for handicapped persons;
- To encourage postsecondary providers of support services to seek cost-effective ways to provide such services and to evaluate and disseminate proven models; and
- To help postsecondary handicapped students succeed in regular education programs with ablebodied peers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1985, the Department:

- Continued its support for four regional centers for deaf postsecondary students,
- Continued funding for 13 ongoing demonstration projects, and
- Awarded 14 new demonstration projects as a result of a grant competition.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: For the four continuation grants awarded to regional centers for deaf postsecondary students, program staff estimate that about 600 students were served by interpreters, note-takers, or other assistants.

Program Effectiveness: No data on effectiveness are available.

D. Highlights of Activities

- Project ACCESS, Miami-Dade County Community College, has developed, fieldtested, and disseminated training modules for use by college support service personnel who work with handicapped students in institutions of higher education.
- Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, has established a center for the assessment of the potential for success of severely disabled students in postsecondary education.
- The Postsecondary Education Consortium, administered at the University of Tennessee, has developed and field-tested a Process Evaluation Model to be applied to demonstration projects within the Consortium.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has been asked by Senator Lowell P. Weicker, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Handicapped of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, to obtain some comparative information on the four schools that participate in the postsecondary education programs supported in part by the Department of Education.

The GAO has been asked to compare student cost data, student characteristics, success of the schools in educating deaf students, and capability of the schools to serve more hearing-impaired students.

This information will be compared with similar information previously obtained by GAO for Gallaudet College and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. The study will be completed in February 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Joseph Rosenstein, (202) 732-1176

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8307

TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED
(CFDA No. 84.029)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Sections 631, 632, and 634, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1431, 1432, 1434) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$90,000,000	$43,500,000
1982	58,000,000	49,300,000
1983	58,000,000	49,300,000
1984	58,000,000	55,540,000
1985	61,150,000	61,000,000

Purpose: To provide preservice and inservice training for special education teachers, administrators, researchers, teacher trainers, and paraprofessionals; to develop innovative instructional models for use by providers of preservice and inservice training; and to support training and information activities for parents and volunteers working with handicapped children and youth.

Eligibility: Funds may be obligated for student stipends, dependency allowances, or program support.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to target funds on national areas of need.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Supported preservice training in roughly 95 percent of funded projects.
- Increased the number of projects on parent and volunteer training and information from 74 to 76 and included a large center for technical assistance to all parent training projects.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Department supports 860 projects that represent training efforts in each State and in three of the territories. In FY 1985, the Department funded 218 new projects and 642 continuation projects.

The following table identifies FY 1985 new and continuation awards by priority area:

Priority Category	Number of Projects
Special Educators	425
Related Service Personnel	76
Leadership Personnel	98
Regular Educators	34
State Education Agencies	56
Special Projects	63
Transition Efforts	9
Parent/Volunteer Projects	76
Infants	15
Rural Projects	8
Total	860

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Special Education Programs is sponsoring an external evaluation of the training program. The contract for this evaluation was let in the summer of 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services; grant files, Grants and Contracts Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The contract for an external evaluation awarded in the summer of 1985 is to begin in February 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Max Mueller, (202) 732-1068

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

HANDICAPPED TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND INFORMATION
(CFDA No. 84.030)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI, Part D, Section 633, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1433) (expires September 30, 1966) and P.L. 98-199.

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$2,500,000	$ 750,000
1982	1,000,000	720,000
1983	1,000,000	720,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	1,050,000	1,025,000

Purpose: To disseminate information on education programs for handicapped children and youths and information on postsecondary educational opportunities for handicapped persons; to provide referral services for the education of the handicapped; and to encourage students and professional personnel to train and work in various special education fields.

Eligibility: Public agencies or nonprofit organizations or institutions are eligible; profit-making organizations are eligible only when their participation is necessary for materials or media access.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide and disseminate information about services and programs for handicapped children and youths and
- To collect and disseminate information about services and programs in postsecondary, vocational, technical, and adult education for the handicapped.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Awarded two continuation cooperative agreements for a clearinghouse on education of handicapped children and youths and a clearinghouse on postsecondary education for the handicapped.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In the first year of a 3-year cooperative agreement, the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth responded to more than 15,000 inquiries, published news digests and newsletters for professionals and parents, participated in numerous workshops, and sponsored public service announcements on television and radio.

In its first year under a 3-year cooperative agreement, the National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Handicapped Individuals issued newsletters and fact sheets and updated a resource directory of organizations for referral.

Program Effectiveness: Program data do not include information on effectiveness.

D. Highlights of Activities

The National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth published, in addition to three issues of its News Digest, the first issue of a semiannual series entitled Transition Summary to share newsworthy articles on facilitating the transition of handicapped youths to adult status. The center also sponsored a 30-second television public information spot to recruit special education teachers and prepared fact sheets on topics such as opportunities in working with the handicapped.

The National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Handicapped Individuals expanded its information on postsecondary opportunities after high school; published fact sheets on educational, recreational, and residential opportunities and resource organizations for severely handicapped persons; and installed a new toll-free number for inquiries.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Helene Corradino, (202) 732-1167

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (CFDA No. 84.023)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part E, Sections 641 and 642, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1441, 1442) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$26,000,000	$15,000,000
1982	20,000,000	10,800,000
1983	20,000,000	12,000,000
1984	20,000,000	15,000,000
1985	21,100,000	16,000,000

Purpose: To improve the education of handicapped children and youths through research and development projects and model programs (demonstrations).

Eligibility: The Secretary may make grants or contracts with States, State or local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit private education or research agencies or organizations. In addition, the Secretary may make contracts to profit-making organizations for research and demonstration projects in physical education and recreation under Section 642.

Allowable Activities: Recipients may use funds for research, surveys, or demonstrations related to education of handicapped children and youths, including the development and conduct of model programs designed to meet the special education needs of such children.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

FY 1985 funds were allocated according to the following funding categories:

1. Field-Initiated Research: To provide grants for nondirected research into subjects suggested by applicants and judged to be responsive to the educational needs of handicapped children and youths.
2. Handicapped Children's Model Program: To provide grants for demonstration projects (youth employment projects and postsecondary projects) to develop, demonstrate, evaluate, and disseminate innovative and exemplary transition services for handicapped youths.

3. **Assessment Research:** To award cooperative agreements for research to determine student outcomes, effectiveness of services, and validity of techniques and instruments for assessment of handicapped children and youths.

4. **Technology Research:** To award grants for research on handicapped students' use of technological devices and systems in schools.

5. **Student Research:** To award grants that provide research opportunities for graduate students to enhance their professional training.

6. **Enhancing Instructional Programming:** To award grants for research on strategies to better accommodate students with learning problems within regular education.

7. **Special Populations Research:** To award grants for research on educational services for handicapped students who are also substance abusers, drop outs, or migrants.

8. **Other Research Activities:** To provide contracts for special-purpose research projects that relate directly to improving the education of handicapped children and youths.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program awarded grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as follows:

	Priority Area	Amount	Number of Awards
1.	Field-Initiated Research	$8,788,000	99
2.	Handicapped Children's Model Program	2,784,000	27
3.	Assessment Research	898,000	3
4.	Technology Research	1,042,000	4
5.	Student Research	152,000	16
6.	Enhancing Instructional Programming	1,130,000	10
7.	Special Populations Research	509,000	6
8.	Other Research Activities	618,000	4
	TOTAL	$15,921,000	169

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The outcomes of this program can be divided into three categories: (1) new or improved products (assessment instruments, instructional materials, technological devices/software); (2) research findings and new information; and (3) personnel trained in research methods.

1. Examples of new or improved products include the following:

   a. A project at American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities has developed an advocacy curriculum for handicapped students in grades 9-12. The materials include instructional materials as well as a planning guide for administrators and curriculum specialists.

b. A project at Gallaudet College adapted and standardized the 1982 Seventh Edition of the Stanford Achievement Tests for use with hearing-impaired students. The scoring provides teachers with information about the individual student's response pattern as well as performance level.

2. Examples of research findings include the following:

   a. A project at the University of Wisconsin has investigated the relationship between family variables and the developmental performance of the handicapped child. A research report summarized the findings that children from "high-risk" families lagged behind children from "low-risk" families on cognitive, academic, and affective measures.

   b. A project at San Francisco State University examined the social skill development of severely handicapped youths within integrated school and community settings. The findings indicated that severely and moderately handicapped children could be taught to initiate and expand their social interactions with peers and co-workers. The findings were summarized in a research report.

   c. A project at Virginia Polytechnic Institute examined the advantages and disadvantages of various State funding formulas for special education. The project provided extensive tables on the types of State formulas as well as on the perceived advantages of each.

   d. A project at the University of California, Santa Barbara, examined the extent to which cognitive mediation training could improve the social behavior of learning disabled delinquents. The results showed that such training could have positive effects.

3. Research training: From FY 1975 through FY 1984, more than 300 graduate students in colleges and universities received support through the student research program. Another 16 graduate students received support in FY 1985. In addition, at least half of all other supported research projects employed graduate students as research assistants, thus giving the students an opportunity to gain research experience on large-scale research projects. Finally, as part of their work, the two minority research institutes have provided graduate students with research training as well as opportunities for participation in programmatic research activities. (E.3)

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1983 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1a. Final Report--G008001917
1b. Final Report--G008300004
2a. Final Report--G008101030
2b. Final Report--G008104154
2c. Final Report--G008300038
2d. Final Report--G008302160
3. Field-Initiated Research Program, Quarterly Reports, March 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Nancy Safer, (202) 732-1109

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS (CFDA No. 84.026)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part F, Sections 651-654, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1451-1454) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$29,000,000	$17,000,000
1982	19,000,000	11,520,000
1983	19,000,000	12,000,000
1984	19,000,000	14,000,000
1985	20,000,000	16,500,000

Purpose: To contribute to the general welfare of deaf persons by providing cultural and educational enrichment through films and to promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons through use of educational media and technology.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to fund the three major program components: (1) captioning, (2) technology demonstration and development, and (3) educational media and materials centers. The program also funded the National Theater for the Deaf and Recordings for the Blind, Inc. The specific objectives for each program component are as follows:

- Captioning: To increase the accessibility of television and film to approximately 14 million deaf and hearing-impaired persons by developing, adapting, producing, and distributing materials that incorporate the most recent technological advancements in film and television.

- Technology Development Projects: To improve the education, independent functioning, and employment of handicapped individuals by assuring that the advances in educational technology are available, are of good quality, and are used appropriately. Funds support projects to improve software for use in special education programming for mild and moderately handicapped children, and to develop devices to compensate for a particular handicapping condition that might impede educational achievement.

- o Educational Media and Materials Centers: To improve the availability of good-quality materials for handicapped children, their parents, and educators by designing, developing, adapting, and disseminating appropriate educational materials and information.

- o National Theater of the Deaf: To provide support for the National Theater of the Deaf in order to raise awareness about the capabilities and creativity of handicapped persons and to provide for the educational and cultural advancement of deaf persons who participate with the National Theater.

- o Recordings for the Blind: To provide tape-recorded textbooks to help visually impaired students of all ages overcome barriers to learning.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Approximately 14 million deaf and hearing-impaired individuals have been reached by technological development and other activities related to captioning and recordings. Research in media technology and special educational materials has contributed to the adjustment and education of handicapped persons as well as assisted their parents and trainers. Through presentations by the National Theater of the Deaf, the self-image of the deaf has been enhanced throughout the United States and in Europe. Finally, Recordings for the Blind, Inc., distributes about 90,000 recorded books to students and records 4,000 new texts each year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Funds for FY 1985 were spent as follows:

Type of Project	Amount	Number of Projects
Captioning	$10,236,000	61
Technology	3,966,000	23
Media and Materials Centers	1,258,000	2
National Theater of the Deaf	500,000	1
Recordings for the Blind, Inc.	540,000	1
Total	$16,500,000	88

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

During FY 1985, funding from the Department is supporting the manufacture of 50,000 newly designed decoder modules and recaption units. The units will incorporate the latest technological advances to permit hearing-impaired persons to view captioned television on their home television sets at a lower cost than has previously been possible.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Interim annual program component reports.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bill Wolf (202) 732-1009

Program Studies : Elizabeth Farquhar, (202) 245-8877

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT--SPECIAL STUDIES
(CFDA 84.159)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part B, Section 618, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 94-142 and 98-199 (20 U.S.C. 1418) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization [1]	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$1,000,000
1982	$2,300,000	480,000
1983	2,300,000	480,000
1984	3,100,000	3,055,000[2]
1985	3,270,000	3,170,000

Purpose: The purpose of the Special Studies activity is twofold:

1. To assess progress in the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act, to assess the impact of the Act, and to assess the effectiveness of State and local efforts to provide free, appropriate public education to all handicapped children and youths; and

2. To provide the Congress with information for policymaking and to provide Federal, State, and local education agencies with information relevant to program management, administration, and effectiveness.

Method of Operation: The Department awards contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements in each fiscal year; most supported activities occur the subsequent year.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Priorities for FY 1985 were as follows:

- To assess special education expenditures,
- To assess the transition of handicapped persons from school to work,
- To assess changes in special education terminology,
- To assess the quality of programming at day and residential facilities, and

- To continue Federal-State cooperative evaluations. The evaluations assess the progress of handicapped students, assess programming features of special purpose facilities, identify and clarify emerging issues, and provide evaluation assistance as stated in the Federal Register.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A mandated study is assessing the cost of State and local expenditures on special education and related services. The mandated study will be available in FY 1987.
- A mandated longitudinal study is being designed to assess the transition to work of handicapped persons following their graduation from high school. The model will be completed in FY 1986.
- A mandated study has been completed on the potential impact of a change in terminology used to define the seriously emotionally disturbed population. The study concluded that a change from current Federal language to behavioral orientation would have minimal long-range effects.
- A new study was awarded to assess improvements in instructional programs for handicapped children and youths in day and residential facilitities.
- Eleven new cooperative agreements with States were begun in FY 1985 and 10 others continue from FY 1984.

C. Costs and Benefits

Studies (New and Continuations)	FY 1985 Obligation	Number of Studies
A. Annual Report		
1. Fast-response network (New)	$ 400,000	1
2. Technical assistance in data analysis (Continuation)	218,000	1
3. Automated data processing (ADP) (Department of Education) (Continuation)	35,000	1
B. Special Evaluation Studies		
1. Longitudinal/child program* (Continuation)	212,000	1
2. Special education expenditures* (Continuation) ADP (Continuation)	506,000 25,000	1
3. Financing Free, Appropriate Public Education (Continuation)	107,000	1
4. Day and Residential (New)	279,000	1
5. Evaluation of Personnel Development (New)	75,000	1
C. Federal-State Evaluations		
1. Cooperative agreements (New)	979,000	11
2. Technical assistance to SEAs (New)	313,000	1
TOTAL	$3,149,000	20

*Mandated

Program Effectiveness: Federal and State staff have used the results of studies funded by this program for technical assistance, training, and public information to carry out the State Grant program and the Preschool Incentive Grants program. Studies also provide the basis for the Annual Report to Congress (mandated by Section 618 of P.L. 94-142) describing the progress toward serving handicapped children. In addition, Department and Congressional staff have used data from studies conducted under this program to redirect program priorities of regional resource centers and deaf-blind centers away from the provision of direct services that overlap State responsibilities and toward providing technical assistance.

D. Highlights

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Education of the Handicapped Funding Priorities--December 13, 1984." Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Special Studies program consists of studies related to Federal funding for handicapped children. None of the studies mentioned here includes assessments of the Special Studies program itself.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Lou Danielson (202) 732-1119

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Authorization established by P.L. 97-35, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, in FY 1982 and FY 1983. The P.L. 98-199 amendments to the Handicapped Act have set the authorization for FYs 1984-86.

2. Adjusted for comparative transfer of $45,000 to Department of Education, departmental management, salaries, and expenses. No adjustments are made for prior fiscal years.

SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED YOUTH
(CFDA No. 84.158)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 626, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 (20 U.S.C. 1425) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
1985	6,330,000	6,330,000

Purpose: To strengthen and coordinate education, training, and related services for handicapped youths; to assist in the transition to postsecondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education, or adult services; and to stimulate the development and improvement of programs for special education at the secondary level.

Eligibility: Grants or contracts are made to institutions of higher education, State education agencies (SEAs) or local education agencies (LEAs), or other appropriate public and private, nonprofit institutions or agencies (including the State job-training coordinating councils and service delivery area administrative entities established under the Job Training Partnership Act). Grants are made for 1 to 3 years.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

To fund cooperative planning demonstrations, secondary education research projects, and two research institutes to conduct long-term programmatic research activities focused on handicapped students' development of skills needed for community living and working, and to determine the effectiveness of various model projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Awarded new grants in the summer of 1985 to fund 15 cooperative planning demonstrations, 10 secondary education research projects, the establishment of an institute on intervention effectiveness and, by September of 1985, the establishment of an institute on secondary and transitional services.

- Continued support for 11 cooperative models for planning and developing transitional services, 12 youth employment projects to assist handicapped youths' transition to work, 15 postsecondary projects that link students leaving public schools to community-based adult training programs, 7 research projects to improve strategies and techniques that facilitate transition to adult and working status, and 16 service demonstration models to develop exemplary programs to prepare youths for competitive or supported employment.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Awards made in 1985 included the following, in addition to cooperative planning demonstrations and secondary education research projects:

- A new institute on intervention effectiveness and
- A new institute on secondary and transitional programs.

Program Effectiveness: The program was initiated in 1984. Continuation applications and Department monitoring indicate that interventions developed in model programs are helping handicapped youths secure competitive and supported employment. Programs are developing training technologies that enable handicapped youth to have access to employment opportunities that were previously unavailable.

D. Highlights of Activities

Two noteworthy projects are these:

- Richmond Unified School District, Richmond, California. The Richmond project is working with severely handicapped students who will be "aging out" of school programs within 2 years. Currently, eight students are involved in community-based training and employment. Working with job coaches, these students are being trained in food services, electronic assembly, and copy machine operation, among other jobs. Four of the students have completed the training and are working full-time, and the other four are in training with their job coaches. The project expects to serve 40 students during the 1985-86 school year.
- International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Washington, D.C. The Projects With Industry (PWI) Model is being used in this demonstration project which is being conducted in Chicago and Los Angeles. In the combined sites, 127 mildly and moderately handicapped youths are involved in the training and employment phases of the project. In the first 8 months of the project, 35 youths have been placed in competitive employment earning an average salary of $7,500. The jobs include maintenance, assembly, machine operation, and utility and warehouse work.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Halloran, (202) 732-1112

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HANDICAPPED RESEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.133)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, Title II and Section 311(a), as amended by P.L. 98-221 (29 U.S.C. 760-762 and 777a[a]) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$90,000,000	$29,750,000
1982	35,000,000	28,560,000
1983	35,000,000	31,560,000 1/
1984	36,000,000	39,000,000 2/
1985	40,000,000	39,000,000 2/

Purposes: To support rehabilitation research and the use of such research to improve the lives of physically and mentally handicapped persons, especially the severely disabled, and to provide for the dissemination of information to rehabilitation professionals and handicapped persons concerning developments in rehabilitation procedures, methods, and devices.

Organization: The research activities of the National Institute of Handicapped Research (NIHR) are conducted primarily through "center" programs, each with a core area of investigation. These programs include Research and Training Centers and Rehabilitation Engineering Centers. Other programs include national and international research, demonstrations, and utilization projects. In FY 1985, NIHR implemented the Innovation Grants Program, which was authorized in the 1984 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act. This program provides small grants to support timely and innovative activities that increase knowledge in the area of disability. In FY 1984, NIHR established the Field-Initiated Research Program to fund grants in areas not included in regularly announced priorities. In FY 1983, it began the Mary E. Switzer Research Fellowship Program to provide fellowships for scientific research on solutions to the rehabilitation problems of disabled persons. NIHR also has the responsibility for promoting coordination and cooperation among Federal agencies conducting rehabilitation research through an Interagency Committee on Handicapped Research.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

o To establish an Innovation Grants Program, as authorized in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1984 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act;

- To develop new regulations implementing the provisions of P.L. 98-221, the 1984 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act;
- To develop a training program in rehabilitation research;
- To initiate a research program to further integrate disabled persons into the community and to promote their living and working in the least restrictive environments;
- To understand the cost factors regarding disabilities and affecting rehabilitation; and
- To stimulate private sector involvement in technology development.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Program regulations were adopted and a competition held under the Innovation Grants Program. NIHR received 255 applications and funded 26.
- Regulations implementing other amendments to the Act were proposed and adopted.
- Policy conferences were held and a program was developed for funding in FY 1986.
- NIHR established a new Rehabilitation Research and Training Center to support community integration, funded a technical assistance contract to assist community groups, and funded two Research and Training Centers in independent living.
- A planning conference was held and a number of papers have been commissioned on the cost of disability and rehabilitation.
- NIHR initiated a White House conference to encourage the private sector to provide computer software and hardware applications for handicapped persons.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The numbers of projects funded in FY 1985 for NIHR's major programs are shown in the following table:

	Number Funded			
	Actual			Estimate
	1983	1984	1985	1986
Research and Training Centers (RTCs)	31	35	37	37
Rehabilitation Engineering Centers (RECs)	16	16	16	16
Research and Demonstration (R&D)	21	24	25	32
Dissemination and Utilization Projects (U&D)*	10	14	14	16
Field-Initiated Projects (FIP)	-	47	56	60
Fellowships	17	17	12	4
Model Spinal Cord Projects 2/	-	17	13	13
Research Training	-	-	-	3
Innovation	-	-	26	8
Total	95	170	199	189

*R&D and U&D were combined before 1985.

Some 450 studies are under way at any given time, and 600 training programs serving approximately 60,000 participants are conducted annually (E-2).

The NIHR appropriation for FY 1985 was $39 million. Of this, approximately $18 million was devoted to the RTC program, $7.8 million to the REC program, $3.4 million for R&D Projects, $2.7 million for U&D, FIP accounted for $4.9 million, $450,000 went for fellowships, $1.3 million for Innovation grants, and $200,000 for related activities.

Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers Program

Of the 37 RTCs funded in FY 1985, 12 are medical rehabilitation RTCs, covering such areas as cardiopulmonary disease, spinal cord injury, health care delivery, special problems of the severely impaired, traumatic brain injury, and neuromuscular dysfunctions. There are 20 vocational rehabilitation RTCs: 2 on deafness, 1 on psychosocial research, 4 on mental health, 3 on mental retardation, 2 on aging, 2 on independent living, 1 on blindness, 2 for American Indians, 1 on pediatric rehabilitation, 1 on rehabilitation of the disabled persons in the Pacific Basin, and 1 on community integration.

Rehabilitation Engineering Centers

Sixteen RECs were funded in FY 1985: (1) to develop innovative methods of applying advanced medical technology, scientific achievement, and psychiatric, psychological, and social knowledge to solve rehabilitation problems; (2) to develop systems of technical and engineering information exchange; and (3) to improve the distribution of technological devices and equipment to handicapped persons.

These centers developed, among other things, a multichannel electrical stimulation system that allows paraplegic patients to stand and walk, and eye glasses that protect the macula from irreversible damage from excessive light following optical surgery. They also adapted industrial robots to help severely disabled persons at the competitive workplace.

Discrete Grant Awards

Approximately $3.4 million was obligated for research through individual grant awards and contracts. Some individual grant awards were for research in the broad areas of psychological and medical rehabilitation, sensory disabilities, severe burns, and other specific problems. In addition, about $2.7 million was devoted to research utilization projects which mainly offer coordinated dissemination and information services, promote innovations in rehabilitation service programs based on R&D results, and instill an awareness of change processes (E.3).

Program Effectiveness: The most recent study of the RTC program was completed in 1980 (E-2). A contract has just been awarded for an evaluation; results are due on December 31, 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. NIHR Long-Range Plan, 1980.
2. "Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers--Overview," 1980, in-house document.
3. "Rehabilitation Engineering Center Program Evaluation: Final Report," Berkeley Planning Associates, Berkeley, California, 1978.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A new study of the RTCs was funded in FY 1985. Small contracts will be let to evaluate selected activities in FY 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Wilmer S. Hunt, (202) 732-1137
Betty Jo Berland, (202) 732-1139

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Includes a $1.5 million supplemental appropriation for the establishment of two Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers. The awards for these centers, one for pediatrics and one for disabled Pacific Basin residents, were made in FY 1984.

2. This appropriation does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury Program funded to the Severely Handicapped Individuals Program (Chapter 328) but administered by NIHR.

REHABILITATION SERVICES--BASIC SUPPORT
(CFDA No. 84.126)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part A and B, except Section 112 (29 U.S.C. 720 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation[1]
1981	$ 945,000,000	$ 854,259,000
1982	899,000,000	863,040,000
1983	943,900,000	943,900,000
1984	1,037,800,000	1,037,800,000
1985	1,117,500,000	1,100,000,000

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide vocational rehabilitation services to persons with mental or physical handicaps or both. Persons with the most severe disabilities receive services first.

Federal and State funds cover the costs of a variety of rehabilitation services: diagnosis; comprehensive evaluation; counseling; training; reader services for the blind; interpreter services for the deaf; medical and related services, such as prosthetic and orthopedic devices; transportation to secure vocational rehabilitation services; maintenance during rehabilitation; employment placement tools, licenses, equipment, supplies, and management services for vending stands or other small businesses for handicapped persons; assistance in the construction and establishment of rehabilitation facilities; and services to families of handicapped persons when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Eligibility: States designate one or two agencies (a separate agency for blind programs is permitted) to administer the program. Physically or mentally disabled individuals are eligible for services if their disabilities are a substantial handicap to employment and if rehabilitation services may improve their chances for employment.

Distribution of Funds: Federal funds are distributed to States according to a formula based on population weighted by per capita income. The statistical factors for fund allocation are (1) the 3 year average of per capita income by State, (2) the total U.S. population, (3) the State population, and (4) the Consumer Price Index.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department had four goals for this program:

1. Employment: To increase the placement of disabled persons, particularly the severely disabled, into competitive employment;

2. Management Improvement: To improve and maintain effective management of the vocational rehabilitation service delivery system;

3. Transition: To improve the transition of students from school to work; and

4. Community-Based Service Providers: To increase the capacity of community-based service providers, which includes rehabilitation facilities and vocational rehabilitation State agencies, to develop a full range of high-quality services that help clients achieve competitive employment.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Employment: In its 64-year history, the vocational rehabilitation program has served more than 10 million persons and has rehabilitated approximately 6 million. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 mandated that priority for services be given to the severely disabled. Over recent years, the proportion of severely disabled persons rehabilitated by State agencies has increased significantly from approximately 32 percent in 1974 to nearly 60 percent in 1985. In 1985 States served about 927,800 active cases and rehabilitated about 228,900. All State agencies either established or added at least one project or practice with the private sector as a way of increasing the number of disabled persons employed into remunerative employment. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and The Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR) compiled a listing of criteria for a statewide placement commitment and developed a description of a placement unit. RSA initiated action to identify State agencies that are incorporating job development and job placement in performance-based approaches. Training and informational materials on the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC) program were made available by RSA to State agencies and other direct service providers.

Management Improvement: RSA promoted increased productivity in the basic program by implementing audit findings that indicated the need for stricter adherence to eligibility criteria and case closure standards. RSA distributed training materials and manuals on standards to State agencies and concerned organizations. RSA collected, reviewed, and prepared reports of monitoring and evaluation unit's activities, which included studying caseload trends and variations among States in the outcomes achieved for clients. Studies and reports will soon be issued for "Similar Benefits" and for the use of appropriate standards.

Working with the National Rehabilitation Information Center, RSA developed a catalog indexing and abstracting all instruments and formal processes used by State Vocational rehabilitation agencies for internal evaluation and management control. This catalog has been distributed to all State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

Transition: The purpose of the transition priority is to increase the capability of the rehabilitation community to help handicapped youths make the transition from secondary or postsecondary school programs to work. While education and rehabilitation agencies have been providing services to this target group, RSA has made new efforts to move young people from school to work more smoothly. An information memorandum stating the results of a study and work group, an interim policy directive about changes in the operational definition and coding of learning disabled persons, and various reports on transition were prepared and sent to the field. Technical assistance to State agencies and Centers for Independent Living to increase replication of "exemplary" programs is continuing.

Community Based Service Providers: This effort is to improve services to handicapped persons, and to strengthen relationships between State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other service providers to bring about a more cohesive community service-delivery system. This effort includes issuing regulations to implement new facilities' provisions, providing grants that place more emphasis on facility personnel training, increased Rehabilitation Continuing Education Programs, funding to expand curricula to include facility personnel training, recommendations for job development and job placement in training in rehabilitation facilities, and a training needs assessment guide. A memorandum of understanding was developed to improve the capability of workshops and establish joint working relationships with the rehabilitation providers. A model State facilities plan was developed and issued to States as guidance. Facilities' task forces have been established in some regions and States.

C. Costs and Benefits

For FY 1985, only estimates of the number of persons served and rehabilitated are available. These are presented below. See the 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for the distribution of the major disabling conditions of persons rehabilitated in FY 1982, the latest year for which client data have been tabulated.

Fiscal Year	Active Cases Served	Cases Closed as Rehabilitated
1982	958,537	226,924
1983	938,923	216,231
1984	936,180	225,772
1985 (est.)	927,800	228,900

The Department has funded a new study to determine which cost and benefit assumptions will produce more accurate benefit-cost ratios (see III. 1).

D. Highlights of Activities

The program's 1985 goals and objectives will be pursued in 1986. Further improvement will depend on the outcomes of other planned studies (see III).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Caseload Statistics, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, Fiscal Year 1983, Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-84-17," March 25, 1985, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration.

2. "Characteristics of Persons Rehabilitated in Fiscal Year 1982. Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-85-37," September 11, 1985, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The following studies are currently planned or in progress:

1. "The Analysis of Benefits and Costs in Vocational Rehabilitation Programs" is a study to assess alternative methods of calculating benefit-cost ratios for the Rehabilitation Services Program, December 1985.

2. "The Analysis of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Caseload and Placement Patterns and Trends" is a study to assess trends in caseload activity and effectiveness of different placement practices (to be completed in FY 1987).

3. "The Analysis of State Funding for Rehabilitation Services" is a study of the financial performance of States under the Federal matching requirement (to be completed by January 1986).

4. A study to contrast the impact of State vocational rehabilitation agency agency services to disabled persons with a comparable group not receiving services is planned to begin in FY 1986 with a design phase.

5. An evaluation of State vocational rehabilitation agency eligibility and extended evaluation practices is scheduled to begin in April 1986.

6. An evaluation of vocational rehabilitation services to the mentally ill is scheduled to begin in April 1986.

7. A data validity study of the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation reporting System is planned to begin in the third quarter of FY 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mark Shoob, (202) 732-1402

Program Studies : Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Note

1. Although under a separate authorization, amounts for Federal maintenance of effort are included here.

CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP)
(CFDA No. 84.161)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part B, Section 112 (29 U.S.C. 732) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$3,500,000	$2,800,000
1982	3,500,000	942,000
1983	3,500,000	1,734,000
1984	6,000,000	6,000,000
1985	6,300,000	6,300,000

Purpose: To inform and advise clients of all available benefits, as well as the rights and responsibilities associated with those benefits, under the rehabilitation Act and related Federal and State assistance programs; to assist clients in their association with projects, programs, and facilities providing rehabilitation services; to help clients pursue legal, administrative, and other available remedies when necessary to ensure the protection of their rights; and to advise State and other agencies of problem areas in the delivery of rehabilitation services and to suggest methods of improving agency performance.

Applicant Eligibility: Grants to States support the Client Assistance Programs (CAPs) which are administered by public or private agencies designated by Governors. Such agencies must be independent of any agency that provides services to individuals under the Act unless the agency designated had, prior to the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, served as a client assistance agency under Section 112 and received Federal financial assistance under the Act.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives were as follows:

- To implement this new mandatory formula grant program through the development of program regulations and a grant-reporting system;
- To process and award grants so that a CAP would be in effect in every State by October 1, 1985; and
- To complete a Congressionally mandated evaluation of the CAP.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department awarded grants totaling $6 million to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the 6 territories.
- The Department completed the first phase of the CAP evaluation, which included the development of evaluation standards and instrumentation.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The first formula grants for CAP were awarded in September 1984; data on the number of persons served and the benefits received are not yet available.

Program Effectiveness:

No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An evaluation of this program, as required by statute, began in late September 1984 and was to be submitted to Congress by February 1, 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Davis, (202) 732-1297

Program Studies : Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-221, changed the funding basis of the CAP from a discretionary project basis to a mandatory formula grant. Funding figures prior to FY 1984 pertain to competitive project grants.

DISCRETIONARY PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING REHABILITATION PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.129)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title III, Part A, Section 304(a) (20 U.S.C. 774) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$45,000,000	$21,675,000
1982	25,500,000	19,200,000
1983	25,500,000	19,200,000
1984	22,000,000	22,000,000
1985	27,000,000	22,000,000

Purpose: To support projects to increase the numbers and improve the skills of personnel trained in providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped people.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To improve the level of skills among and increase the numbers of trained personnel in skill areas where there are shortages of rehabilitation personnel;
- To support the training of rehabilitation workers in acquiring and improving job development and job placement skills; and
- To improve, through training and communication of standards, the management of rehabilitation programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Facilitated the emergence of new rehabilitation professionals who trained handicapped persons to live independently, to develop job skills, and to seek and maintain employment;
- Developed postemployment training guidelines for community service providers to implement transitional work programs for severely handicapped adults; and

- o Developed program evaluation techniques, a case review system, and a clearinghouse for the management and dissemination of rehabilitation training materials and approaches.

C. Costs and Benefits

Trainees Served: A total 13,580 trainees were served under 329 project grants in FY 1985. Costs by type of training (see E.1) are shown in this table:

Number of Trainees	Type of Training	Total Grant Amounts	Average Federal Cost per Trainee
3,175	Long-term	$16,553,000	$5,213
1,925	Continuing education	2,200,000	1,143
8,400	Inservice	2,800,000	333
80	Experimental	447,000	5,587
13,580		$22,000,000	

Program Scope: Program serves all skills and professions relating to vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Types of Benefits Provided: This program is used for a wide variety of training including long-term training in established professional rehabilitation fields; inservice training and continuing education; and experimental or innovative training projects.

Program Effectiveness: Third-party validation of the overall program was not completed. Each training project has a self-evaluation or third-party evaluation component.

D. Highlights of Activities

To meet the legislative mandate to allocate training funds on the basis of documented rehabilitation personnel needs, a contractor is working to provide these data early in 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Analysis of Grantee Applications," Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1983.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A contract is in progress to study the effectiveness of the program and to provide a basis for allocations according to documented skills deficiencies and rehabilitation personnel needs.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:. Delores Watkins, (202) 732-1332

Program Studies : Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SEVERELY HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part C, Section 311(a)(1) (29 U.S.C. 777a) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$ 9,765,000
1982	$12,210,000 1/	8,846,000
1983	12,210,000 1/	9,259,000
1984	12,900,000 1/	6,235,000 2/
1985	13,600,000	9,635,000 2/

Purpose: To support demonstration projects that develop innovative methods and comprehensive service programs to help severely handicapped persons achieve satisfactory vocational adjustments.

Eligibility: Public or private, nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible to compete for grant awards.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to initiate supported work projects to enable severely handicapped persons, for whom competitive employment is unlikely, to perform in a work setting with ongoing support.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Among the 24 continuation projects funded, the methods include using computers for rehabilitation and training; coordinating community-based vocational programs for severely disabled persons; assisting persons in the transition from school or institution to work; and providing prevocational, micrographics, and life skills training, or pre-, post-, and transitional-employment support services.

C. Costs and Benefits

Costs and Clients Served: The new FY 1986 projects will serve an estimated 45,000 clients. All funds for 10 new projects were used for supported work in 1985. In addition, the Administration on Developmental

Disabilities in the Department of Health and Human Services transferred $500,000 to the Department of Education for its initiative.

Program Scope: Thirty-four new and continuing demonstration projects address vocational rehabilitation needs of persons with the following disabilities: cerebral palsy, mental retardation, mental illness, spinal cord injury, arthrogryposis, muscular dystrophy, blindness and other visual impairments, deafness and other hearing impairments, head trauma, learning disabilities, and multiple severe disabilities. Projects also coordinate existing services to more effectively reach target groups, and conduct outreach and support activities for persons who are not yet receiving rehabilitation services.

Program Effectiveness: According to program office data, successful project methods and techniques are frequently incorporated into State vocational rehabilitation agency programs, sustained with formula grant and non-Federal dollars, and used in part or throughout a State.

Also according to program data, a substantial number of persons with different severe disabilities have benefited from vocational rehabilitation and placement services.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

An evaluation of the Special Demonstration Projects for the Severely Disabled is due on November 30, 1986, and a contract was awarded to Harold Russell Associates on May 29, 1985. The contractor has drafted evaluation standards and the instrument for data collection.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Roseann R. Rafferty, (202) 732-1349

Program Studies : Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. Total authorization for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314, and 315 combined.

2. Does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury program transferred to the National Institute of Handicapped Research or $950,000 for the Migratory Worker projects.

SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR INITIATING RECREATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title III, Section 316 (29 U.S.C. 777) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$2,000,000
1982	$2,000,000	1,884,000
1983	2,000,000	2,000,000
1984	2,000,000	2,000,000
1985	2,100,000	2,100,000

Purpose: To establish or initiate programs of recreational activities for handicapped persons, with special emphasis on increasing recreational services for handicapped clients served by State vocational rehabilitation agencies. The diverse recreational activities carried out within these projects are intended to contribute to the rehabilitation, mobility, and socialization of handicapped people.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To fund recreation projects that will increase the mobility and socialization of handicapped persons and
- To promote the development or improvement of physical fitness and leisure time programs for mentally and physically handicapped persons.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Projects addressed mobility and socialization through indoor and outdoor leisure activities such as sports and arts and crafts.
- Therapeutic and physical development activities included fitness workshops, swimming, and camping.

C. Costs and Benefits

In FY 1985, an estimated 16,500 handicapped persons were served by the 30 projects funded. No information about project effectiveness is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are underway.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : Barbara Coates, (202) 245-8281

REHABILITATION SERVICES--SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED MIGRATORY AND SEASONAL FARM WORKERS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 312, P.L. 93-112, as amended (29 U.S.C. 777b) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$1,325,000
1982	$12,210,000 1/	951,000
1983	12,210,000 1/	951,000
1984	12,900,000 1/	950,000
1985	13,600,000 1/	950,000

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory or seasonal farm workers to help them acquire new work skills and thereby become qualified (1) to obtain employment in other areas, or (2) to "settle out" (obtain permanent employment) and leave the migrant stream; or to provide treatment necessary for the client to continue as a migratory or seasonal farm worker. State rehabilitation agencies or local agencies administering a vocational rehabilitation program under written agreements with State agencies are the eligible grantees. Eligible beneficiaries consist of physically or mentally handicapped migrant or seasonal farm workers. Family members may also receive services necessary for the rehabilitation of the handicapped migrant.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to process applications and award new and continuation grants for comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migrant workers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded new grants to four projects in four States and continuation grants to seven projects in seven States.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Ten State rehabilitation agencies and one agency for the blind are grantees for 11 FY 1985 projects, and they will serve approximately 3,000 migrant workers. The cost for each of these projects ranges from

$77,000 to $100,000. Services included a heavy emphasis on outreach, bilingual counseling, physical/mental restoration, prevocational adjustment, vocational training, and job placement. Because of the high rate of client mobility and their remote rural employment, agencies cannot always complete the entire rehabilitation process or provide vocational rehabilitation services in the traditional manner.

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available, but an evaluation of the program was begun in FY 1985 and results will be available in FY 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

In FY 1985, the Department cosponsored a national policy meeting on the special education needs of handicapped migrant students. At this meeting, conducted through the Education Commission of the States' Interstate Migrant Education Council, the participants considered issues such as awareness, compliance, identification and placement, assessment and diagnosis, instructional materials, interagency cooperation, data collection, information sharing and use of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. (E. 2.)

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Evaluation Reports, Fiscal Year 1983. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1984.

2. National Policy Workshop on Special Education Needs of Migrant Handicapped Students, Proceedings Report. Interstate Migrant Education Council, San Antonio, Texas, 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An evaluation of the program by E.H. White and Co. was begun in FY 1985. The period of performance is July 1985 through October 1986. The evaluation has two components: (1) an assessment of projects and their service delivery systems and (2) a description of the condition of currently served and currently unserved but eligible recipients of services.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : James English, (202) 245-9401

Note

1. This figure is the overall amount authorized for Sections 311, 312, 314, and 315. The amount for Section 312 is $5 million.

HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-221, Title II (Helen Keller National Center Act) (29 U.S.C. 1901) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$3,200,000
1982	$3,500,000	3,137,000
1983	3,500,000	3,500,000
1984	4,000,000	4,000,000
1985	4,200,000	4,200,000

Purpose: To provide comprehensive services for deaf-blind youths and adults, to train personnel to work with deaf-blind persons, and to conduct relevant research. The Center has one primary facility at Sands Point, New York. In addition, a network of 10 regional offices refers deaf-blind persons to the Center from all 50 states.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve rehabilitation services to deaf-blind and multihandicapped deaf-blind persons and

- To foster research and development activities that improve the social and economic aspects of life for deaf-blind persons.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The National Training Team and the Affiliation Network System were further developed to strengthen local services to deaf-blind persons. One new regional office and 15 additional agencies were added to the network system. In addition, the Center has increased the number of staff serving multihandicapped persons, particularly rubella victims. The Center also has entered into agreements with the Mississippi State University Research and Training Center and the University of California Research and Training Center for needed research on multihandicapped persons.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1985, the Center served 207 trainees at its main facility and provided referrals and counseling to another 1,253 deaf-blind persons through its regional offices (see E.).

Program Effectiveness: The Department is conducting an evaluation of the program. The report will be issued in February 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. FY 1985 Annual Report of the Helen Keller National Center.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An annual evaluation is in progress; a report will be issued in February 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Werner, (202) 732-1314

Program Studies : Elizabeth Farquhar, (202) 245-8877

REHABILITATION SERVICES--PROJECTS WITH INDUSTRY
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112 as amended, Title VI, Part B, Section 621 (29 U.S.C. 795g) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$ 5,250,000
1982	$ 8,000,000	7,510,000
1983	8,000,000	13,000,000 1/
1984	13,000,000	13,000,000
1985	14,400,000	14,400,000

Purpose: (1) To provide handicapped persons with training and work experiences in a realistic work setting in order to prepare them for employment in the competitive market; (2) to provide handicapped persons with supportive services in order to permit them to continue in the employment for which they have been trained; and (3) to expand job opportunities for handicapped persons by providing placement services, job development and modification, special aids, appliances, or work-site modifications that will permit employment of handicapped persons.

Eligibility: Any public or private, for profit or nonprofit agency or organization able to provide training or employment for handicapped persons, including private corporations, rehabilitation facilities, rehabilitation associations, educational institutions, labor unions, trade associations, foundations, and State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program was to provide an increasing number of handicapped persons with training and on-the-job experience in realistic work settings to prepare them for employment in the competitive labor market.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

It is estimated that approximately 14,500 disabled persons, mostly severely disabled, will receive services, and approximately 12,100 of them will be placed in jobs in the competitive labor market at salaries comparable to those paid non-disabled employees.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, 98 Projects With Industry programs were supported to train and place in employment more than 12,100 handicapped persons, who are expected to earn salaries commensurate to salaries paid to non-handicapped employees.

Program Effectiveness: There is no new information on program effectiveness (see the FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information available).

D. Highlights of Activities

Any program improvement and legislative recommendations will follow the receipt of the National Evaluation Study.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Assessment of the Projects With Industry Program, Advanced Technology, Inc., McLean, Virginia, and Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1983.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A congressionally mandated evaluation of this program was started in FY 1985; a final report is due to Congress in February 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Arthur Cox, (202) 732-1333

Program Studies : Arthur Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Note

1. The $8 million regular appropriation in FY 1983 was supplemented by a one-time supplemental appropriation of $5 million under the Jobs Bill.

CENTERS FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING
(CFDA No. 84.132)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title VII, Part B, Section 711, P.L. 93-112, as amended by P.L. 93-516, 94-230 and 9735 and 98-221, Title VII, Part B of P.L. 95-602 (29 U.S.C. 796e) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$200,000,000 1/	$18,000,000
1982	19,400,000 2/	17,280,000
1983	19,400,000 2/	19,400,000
1984	21,000,000 2/	19,400,000
1985	22,000,000	22,000,000 3/

Purpose: To provide independent living services to severely handicapped individuals to help them to function more independently in family and community settings or to secure and maintain appropriate employment.

Eligibility: The principal eligible applicant is the State vocational rehabilitation agency; however, if a State agency fails to apply for a grant within 6 months after grants are available, any local public or private, nonprofit agency within the State may apply directly.

The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98-221) mandate that current grantees be funded through September 30, 1986.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide noncompeting discretionary grants to operate existing Centers for Independent Living--facilities offering a combination of rehabilitation services to enable severely disabled persons to live more independently in family or community settings or to secure and maintain employment.
- To promote the substantial involvement of disabled persons in policy direction and management of established centers and to promote the employment of disabled persons in the centers.

- To competitively award new grants to centers to expand independent living services to disability groups not currently being assisted or to provide independent living services for severely disabled persons in transition from school or institution to community living, or, where appropriate, employment.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Supported these 76 current noncompeting grantees:

  -45 State general vocational rehabilitation agencies (including 5 joint projects with State vocational rehabilitation agencies for the blind),

  -22 local nonprofit organizations, and

  -9 State vocational rehabilitation agencies for the blind.

- Funded the operation of 160 existing centers, providing services to an estimated 30,000 severely disabled persons.

- Staffed centers with more than 40 percent disabled persons, according to previous data.

- Competitively awarded approximately $1.87 million to 39 successful applicants at an average of slightly less than $50,000 each to expand services to additional groups of severely disabled persons or to provide transitional services for persons leaving school or institutions.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Effectiveness

Section 711 mandates that the program be evaluated and that evaluation standards be developed and published. Accordingly, the Department awarded a contract of $335,790 in FY 1984 to Berkeley Planning Associates for two purposes:

1. To develop the mandated standards for evaluation and

2. To use the standards as a basis for mandated evaluation of the program.

The report was due to Congress in February 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The study cited in II.C. is in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Jones, (202) 732-1345

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Authorization for Parts A, B, and C.
2. Authorization for Part B only.
3. Appropriation was $27 million; $5 million went to Part A, funded for the first time, and $22 million to Part B.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED AMERICAN INDIANS (CFDA 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, Title I, Section 130 (29 U.S.C 750) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	Indefinite	$ 650,000
1984	Indefinite	715,000
1985	Indefinite	1,430,000

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped American Indians who live on Federal or State reservations to prepare them for suitable employment.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objective was to increase participation in this program by means of a new grants competition.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Under the grants competition, six applications were received from qualified Indian groups, and three awards were made. In addition to extending participation of the Navajo Vocational Rehabilitation Program (the only participant in FY 1984), the Department made new awards to the Yakima Tribal Council and the Chippewa Cree Business Committee.

C. Cost and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1985, the three grantees provided vocational rehabilitation services to an estimated 750 Indians.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available, pending completion of an evaluation initiated in May of 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

In May 1985, an award of $99,600 was made to Support Services Inc. of Washington, D.C. for an evaluation of the Handicapped American Indian Vocation Rehabilitation Program. The study is scheduled to be completed in December 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : Rob Barnes, (202) 472-5192

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--BASIC GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.048)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, Title II, Part A (U.S.C. 2331-2334, 98 Stat. 2450-2454) and Title II, Part B (20 U.S.C. 2341-42, 98 Stat. 2455-57) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1981	$1,325,000,000	$612,082,728
1982	735,000,000 2/	587,736,648
1983	735,000,000 2/	657,902,898
1984	735,000,000 2/	666,628,758
1985	853,300,000 2/	777,633,429 3/

Purpose: To help States expand and improve vocational education programs and ensure equal opportunity in vocational education to traditionally underserved populations.

Eligibility: States and Territories become eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Board for Vocational Education, a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and a State Council on Vocational Education. They must also develop a 3-year State Plan, with specified review procedures and assurances. This program is forward-funded.

Assistance to States: Each State and Outlying Territory may reserve up to 7 percent of its Basic Grant allocation for State administration. Part of these administrative funds are to be used to satisfy the requirement that each State devote at least $60,000 of its Basic Grant funds to support the activities of a full-time sex equity coordinator. Of the remaining funds, 57 percent is to be allocated for Part A, Vocational Education Opportunities, as follows: 10 percent for serving handicapped students, 22 percent for disadvantaged students, 12 percent for adult training and retraining, 8.5 percent for single parents and homemakers, 3.5 percent for programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping, and 1 percent for serving criminal offenders in correctional institutions.

The remaining 43 percent is earmarked for Part B, Vocational Education Improvement, Innovation, and Expansion activities. Part B funds may by used for any of 24 specified purposes, including new or expanded programs, career counseling and guidance, acquisition of equipment, renovation of facilities, and staff development. For career guidance and counseling, each State must expend at least the amount it expended in program year 1984, and some Part B money must be used for curriculum development and inservice and preservice teacher training. Part B money must be used only for program improvement, innovation, and expansion.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To prepare and publish new regulations;
- To assist States in developing new State Plans; and
- To review and approve State Plans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- New regulations were published in the Federal Register on August 16, 1985.
- Regional workshops were held for State staff to help them prepare new State Plans.
- An electronic mail system was established to speed communication to and from States.

C. Costs and Benefits

Some of the new Perkins Act Basic Grant programs and requirements are different from those funded under the antecedent Vocational Education Act. One criticism of the expired Basic Grant Program had been that, although a number of priority areas were identified in the legislation, States frequently used funds for maintenance of regular vocational programs. The Perkins Act precludes doing this except in cases in which a program, by its nature, improves vocational education. Because the program is new, information about its implementation is not yet available.

Program Scope

Enrollment Estimates: Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) data for 1982-83, the most recent year for which such data are available, indicate that there were some 12.9 million enrollments in Basic Grant programs included under vocational education State Plans.4/ (These data and the expenditure data discussed later exclude those for Consumer and Homemaking programs, which are discussed separately in Chapter 402).

The VEDS data also indicate that some 5.9 million enrollments (45 percent of State Plan-reported enrollments) were in occupationally specific programs. Of the total 12.9 million enrollments, 55 percent were at the secondary level and the remainder were postsecondary and adult. In addition, the 1982-83 VEDS data indicate that approximately 531,377 handicapped persons, 1,113,112 disadvantaged persons, and 127,959 persons with limited English proficiency were served in these Basic Grant programs (E.1).

Expenditures: Financial data from States' Financial Status Reports have been aggregated for program year 1981-82. (Because the Perkins Act programs are so recent, the data here reflect programs under Sections 110, 120, 130, 140, and 102[d] of the previous legislation). These data indicate that the States expended some $679 million in basic grants, program improvement and supportive services, special programs for the disadvantaged, and State planning program funds. These expenditures were matched by more than $6.8 billion in State and local outlays. Approximately 79 percent of the Federal money was used for vocational programs; State and local administration consumed another 9 percent. The other activities that accounted for more than 1 percent of the expenditures were cooperative education (3.5 percent), construction (2.5 percent), work-study (1.5 percent), and industrial arts (1.2 percent) (E.2).

Of the 1981-82 expenditures, $379 million of the Federal share went to programs for handicapped or disadvantaged persons, students with limited English proficiency, and postsecondary and adult vocational education. The State match for these programs was approximately $3.8 billion. Almost 46 percent of that $379 million was used for postsecondary and adult vocational education programs. Another 33.3 percent went to programs for the disadvantaged, 18.7 percent to programs for the handicapped, and approximately 2 percent for students with limited English proficiency (E.2).

Program Effectiveness

The new Basic Grants programs are very different from those funded under the antecedent Vocational Education Act. Therefore, it is premature to address effectiveness under the Perkins Act.

D. Highlights of Activities

Fifty-three State and Territory Plans for the Perkins Act were submitted and approved.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Reports from Vocational Data Education System (VEDS), U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

2. Vocational Education Report by the Secretary of Education to the Congress: 1983.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of the implementation of the Perkins Act is in progress. The first report, due in the summer of 1986, will provide information about how nine States developed plans and processes to administer the Act.

The Department continued efforts to improve the data collection system for vocational education.

Plans for the National Assessment of Vocational Education mandated in the Perkins Act will be available in late FY 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Leroy Cornselsen, (202) 732-2441

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8362

Notes

1. These amounts include funds apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act's permanent authorization. For fiscal years 1981 through 1984, the amounts represent funds for basic grants, program improvement, and supportive services under P.L. 94-482. For FY 1985, the amounts represent the basic grant under P.L. 98-542.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but did not break out authorization by program. For FY 1985, the Perkins Act authorized $835.3 million for Titles I (other than Section 112), II, and IV (other than Part E). The Basic Grant authorization is not further broken down. However, set-asides for special populations are specified for distribution of Title II, Part A funds, as described in the text.

3. Figures listed are those appropriated for the Basic Grant. Of these, 57 percent are earmarked for the purposes of Part A of the Perkins Act.

4. Early in 1983, the Department suspended collection of VEDS data because of continuing problems with the system. Because the Perkins Act mandates the operation of a vocational education data system, the Department is developing a system to take the place of VEDS. Until that system is operational, current data on enrollments in the Basic Grants Program will not be available.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--SPECIAL PROGRAM: CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKER EDUCATION (CFDA No. 84.049)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, Title III, Part B, P.L. 98-524 (20 U.S.C. 2361-2363; 98 Stat. 2458-2459) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$ 80,000,000	$ 30,347,000
1982	Unspecified 1/	29,133,000
1983	Unspecified 1/	31,633,000
1984	Unspecified 1/	31,633,000
1985	32,000,000	31,633,000

Purpose: To assist States by providing Federal funds for programs and services in consumer and homemaker education.

Eligibility: States become eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Board for Vocational Education, a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, a State Council on Vocational Education, and a 3-year State Plan, with specified review procedures and assurances. This is a forward-funded program.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives were to encourage States as follows:

- To revise program offerings in consumer and homemaker education in secondary schools in light of recent national education reports,
- To engage educators and business and industry representatives in jointly designing and updating curriculum, and
- To promote sex equity and to increase participation in economically depressed areas.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- States have launched, in response to national education studies, curriculum initiatives, including, Life Management Skills (Florida), Computer Assisted Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs (Michigan), and Consumer and Homemaking Interrelativeness of Home and Work (Ohio).

o All States and Territories are offering consumer and homemaking education programs accessible to all populations.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Approximately one-fourth of vocational coursework in high school is taken in consumer and homemaking, according to data from the Department's High School and Beyond study.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "State Annual Accountability Reports for Vocational Education", Division of Vocational Education Services, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

2. "Research and Curriculum Projects by State Departments of Education, 1983-84", Vocational Home Economics Education, Division of Vocational Education Services, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of the implementation of the Perkins Act is in progress which will include information on consumer and homemaker programs.

States and universities are conducting research in cooperation with professional organizations and the private sector.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bertha G. King, (202) 732-2421

Program Studies : Rob Barnes, (202) 472-5192

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act but did not break out authorization by individual program.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION-OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524) Title III, Parts A-E (20 U.S.C. 2351-2393; 98 Stat. 2457-2465) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/ (all programs except Part B)	Appropriation
1985	$ 71,000,000	0

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to States for vocational education support programs by community-based organizations under Part A; adult training, retraining and employment development under Part C; comprehensive career guidance and counseling programs under Part D; and industry-education partnership for training in high-technology occupations under Part E.

Eligibility: States may receive funds by including information and assurances required under the Act in State plans or amendments.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

This is a new program. No funds were appropriated for Title III in FY 1985 other than those earmarked for Part B, Consumer and Homemaker Education Program. This program has been funded as a separate line item for many years and is described in Chapter 402.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Leroy Cornelson, (202) 732-2441

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Note

1. P.L. 98-524 authorized the following amounts for Parts A-E of Title III during FY 1985:

Part A-$15,000,000
Part C-$35,000,000
Part D-$ 1,000,000
Part E-$20,000,000

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--RESEARCH AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION
(CFDA No. 84.051)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act of 1984, Title IV, Sections 402, 404, and 422 (20 U.S.C. 2402, 2404, 2422; 98 Stat. 2466, 2468, 2473) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1981	$66,250,000	$7,835,073
1982	2/	8,536,073
1983	2/	8,036,073
1984	2/	8,178,000
1985	3/	8,321,000

Purposes: To conduct research, furnish information, and provide related support services designed to improve access of disadvantaged persons to vocational education programs; stimulate private sector involvement; to promote more effective coordination at all levels among programs dealing with vocational education, employment training, and economic development; and to strengthen existing programs through the development and dissemination of curriculum materials, increased emphasis on acquisition of basic academic skills, new evaluation methods, and current information on occupational supply and demand. These common purposes are addressed through the activities of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) and the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC), and by means of sponsored research. Further purposes associated with these activities are as follows:

- NCRVE. NCRVE is a nonprofit, university-affiliated entity designated by the Secretary for a 5-year period on the advice of a panel of nationally recognized experts in vocational education, administration, and research. In addition to making major contributions to the common purposes just described, NCRVE is charged with developing State and local leadership and making annual assessments of joint planning and coordination under the Carl D. Perkins and Job Training Partnership Acts.

- NOICC. Under the direction of a committee representing the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, and Labor, plus four offices of the Department of Education, NOICC is charged with developing and implementing in cooperation with State and local agencies an occupational information system to meet a comprehensive range of planning, program administration, and career guidance needs.

- Sponsored research. Under a competitive process in which preference is given to postsecondary institutions, the Secretary is charged with conducting a coordinated program of applied research, leadership development, and inservice training in furtherance of the purposes of the Carl D. Perkins Act.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

For FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives were as follows:

- To conduct a review of NCRVE's performance for the past 2 1/2 years (the remaining 2 years will be a grant, as required by the Perkins Act);
- To complete a review of the six regional Curriculum Coordination Centers (CCCs); and
- To complete several major studies awarded in FY 1985 and previous years.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- An independent review of NCRVE was conducted in June by a team of outside experts. (For a summary of the team's findings and recommendations, see Section C.)
- A review of the CCCs was completed in September 1985 by Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Studies and projects completed during the year include curriculum materials for training robotics/automated systems technicians, standards for Business Education and training in Trades and Industry, and materials for State and regional workshops designed to emphasize contributions of vocational education to defense preparedness.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, exclusive of special or supplementary appropriations but including prior year carryovers, program funds were allocated as follows:

NCRVE	$5,400,000
NOICC	2,243,100
Research projects (including support for CCCs)	1,563,893
Total	$9,206,993

Program Effectiveness. Based on one week's intensive interviews, consultations, and document reviews covering NCRVE's performance from January 1983 to June 1985, a team of six senior professionals submitted a report (see E. 1) with the following findings and recommendations:

- NCRVE's management is exceptionally effective.
- NCRVE's products are of high quality and enjoy widespread acceptance.

- NCRVE's research function has been significantly impaired by contractual stipulations, restrictions, and prohibitions imposed by the Federal Government. These have discouraged the collection of new data, limited the attractiveness of NCRVE's printed products, and diverted resources toward service-oriented activities.

- NCRVE should be given more freedom of action, and Federal support should be increased to $6 million for the 1986 grant year.

- Representation of business and industry groups on the NCRVE's Advisory Committee should be increased.

- In about a year, an independent assessment should be conducted "of the degree to which the service activities of the Applied Research and Development program have been shifted toward a genuine research effort."

In formal comments on the review team's report (E. 2), the Office of Vocational and Adult Education observed that most of the restrictions judged to have hampered NCRVE's performance will be lifted automatically with the conversion of departmental support from a contract to a grant in January 1986, and that the composition of the Advisory Committee has been constrained by the authorizing legislation.

NOICC. In its annual administrative report (E. 3), NOICC reports the following accomplishments:

- Coding instruments designed to systematically match occupational data with training programs have been updated and computerized.

- Software has been prepared to enable States to generate employment estimates for smaller areas.

- Guidance materials designed for students exploring military careers were produced and distributed to nearly 20,000 schools and recruiting stations.

- Twelve States have established microcomputer-based systems for program planning, and another 22 States are developing similar systems.

- Statewide career information systems are in place at nearly 13,000 institutional sites where they have the potential to serve about 5 million persons per year.

Research. On the basis of information submitted by the six CCCs, an assessment was made of the impacts and effectiveness of the National Network for Curriculum Coordination (E. 4). The report offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

- The major purpose of facilitating access to curriculum materials has been accomplished and has resulted in substantial savings of time and money.

- Improvements in the CCC reporting system are needed to obtain a clearer picture of the accomplishments of CCCs.

- CCCs should be encouraged to develop specialized resources in certain emerging technologies.

- Curriculum review procedures should be instituted to ensure high standards.

D. Highlights of Activities

- Problems of national significance were addressed through sponsored research, including research into the problem of displaced workers, improving access for special populations, and strengthening basic skills instruction in vocational education.

- An electronic communication system was established, and 48 States are now participating.

- NCRVE and the six CCCs were evaluated (see Section C).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Report of the Mid-Contract Review of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at the Ohio State University," Columbus, Ohio, July 15, 1985.

2. "The Office of Vocational and Adult Education's Response to the Recommendations in the Report of the Mid-Contract Review Conducted at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education on June 10-14, 1985," Washington, D.C., undated.

3. Status of the NOICC/SOICC Network, June 30, 1985, NOICC Administrative Report No. 11, October, 1985.

4. An Assessment of the Impact and Effectiveness of the National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocational and Technical Education, prepared by Policy Studies Associates, Inc., for the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. 300-82-0380, September 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further program studies are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

NCRVE and CCCs Program Operations: Glenn Boerrigter, (202) 732-2367

Sponsored Research : Muriel Shay Tapman, (202) 732-2361

Program Studies : Rob Barnes, (202) 472-5192

Notes

1. Funds are appropriated for this activity on a "no year" basis. They become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and they remain available until expended. In addition, $358,073 for fiscal years 1981 through 1984 and $142,963 for FY 1985 (which remains available for only 1 year) was apportioned to this activity annually from the Smith-Hughes Act permanent appropriation.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act for fiscal years 1982-84, but did not break out authorization by program.

3. Section 3(a) of the Perkins Act authorizes $835,300,000 for Titles I (exclusive of Section 112), II, and IV (other than Part E). From the amount appropriate for Section 3(a), Section 101 reserves 2 percent for national programs under Title IV.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--INDIAN AND HAWAIIAN NATIVE PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.101)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-542). Title I, Section 123 (20 U.S.C. 2313; 90 Stat. 2440) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/	
		Indians	Hawaiian Natives
1981	$ 13,250,000	$6,182,654	NA
1982	2/	5,936,734	NA
1983	2/	6,645,484	NA
1984	2/	6,733,624	NA
1985	835,000,000	9,895,639	$1,729,128

Purpose: To award grants and contracts to eligible Indian tribes (1981-1985) and organizations primarily serving and representing Hawaiian natives (1985) to plan, conduct, and administer programs or portions of programs authorized by and consistent with the Vocational Education Act. Eligible applicants may apply for grants for any programs, services, and activities cited as consistent with the Act.

Eligibility: The tribal organization or any Indian tribe eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 or under the Act of April 16, 1934 is eligible for funds under this program. Any organization that primarily serves and represents Hawaiian natives and is recognized by the Governor of Hawaii may apply for funds.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The program office addresses the following objectives:

Indian Programs: To improve the job placement record of trainees served under this authority and to promote program linkages to tribal and Hawaiian native economic development plans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hawaiian Native Programs: To improve linkages with the applicant and the State education agency (SEA) to avoid duplication of effort.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Secretary gave priority to applicants who could substantiate that employers would employ at least 50 percent of trainees for new grantees and 65 percent of trainees for previous grantees.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Trainees: An estimated 2,000 Indian trainees in 17 States were enrolled in vocational programs in 28 grants in FY 1985. Training is offered in a wide range of occupations including public administration, business management, welding, clerical work, auto mechanics, appliance repairs, heavy-equipment operation, road building, construction, agriculture, carpentry, plumbing, bookkeeping, and computer programming in FY 1985 (E.1).

Costs: Costs vary widely; the smallest Indian grant was $45,429, the largest grant, $556,099. The enrollment varies from 12 to 300 students. Some programs carry a high per pupil cost because of the type of equipment needed and the isolation of the location. High-cost programs include computer programming and heavy-equipment operation.

Program Effectiveness: Program officials estimate that placement rates for programs designed for immediate trainee placement are about 65 percent. The target population served by these programs has a history of disadvantagement and high unemployment; however, program staff report that placement rates have been slowly improving.

D. Highlights of Activities

- Increasing the job placement rate continued as a priority for the Indian program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Project Summary data, June 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for further information

Program Operations: Howard Hjelm, (202) 732-5550

Program Studies : Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. The Perkins Act requires that 1-1/2 percent of vocational education funds be used to support Indian and Hawaiian Native Programs, of which 1-1/4 percent will support Indian projects and the remainder will support a new Hawaiian program. Previous legislation authorized 1 percent of funds for Indian tribes and organizations.

2. The vocational education authorization for FY 1982-84 is from the Omnibus Budget Reconcilitation Act, which did not list authorization by specific programs.

BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES, HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA Nos. 84.077, 84.099, and 84.100)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524), Title IV, Part E (20 U.S.C. 2441; 98 Stat. 2477) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$ 90,000,000	$3,960,000
1982	735,000,000 1/	3,686,000 2/
1983	735,000,000 1/	3,686,000 2/
1984	735,000,000 1/	3,686,000 2/
1985	3,700,000	3,686,000 3/

Purpose: Section 441 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act authorizes three programs for bilingual vocational education. The Bilingual Vocational Training Program provides financial assistance for out-of-school youth and unemployed or underemployed adults with limited English proficiency to prepare these people for jobs in recognized occupations or new and emerging occupations. The Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program provides financial assistance for training instructors of bilingual vocational education. The Bilingual Vocational Materials, Methods, and Techniques Program provides financial assistance for development of instructional and curriculum materials, methods, or techniques for bilingual vocational training.

Eligible Recipients: For bilingual vocational training grants and contracts (CFDA No. 84.077), eligible recipients include local education agencies; appropriate State agencies; postsecondary education institutions; private nonprofit vocational training institutions; and nonprofit educational or training organizations especially created to serve persons who normally used a language other than English. Private, for-profit agencies and organizations are eligible only for contracts.

For the bilingual vocational instructor training grants or contracts (CFDA No. 84.099), eligible recipients are State agencies and public and private, nonprofit educational institutions. Private, for-profit educational institutions are eligible only for contracts.

For bilingual vocational materials, methods and technique grants and contracts (CFDA No. 84.100), eligible recipients are State agencies, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations. Private, for-profit organizations and individuals are eligible only for contracts.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The following goals were identified by the program in FY 1985:

- To use Federal discretionary dollars to increase the effectiveness of bilingual vocational training programs throughout the country, with an emphasis on model program development.

- To provide a Federal leadership role in establishing cooperation between State staff responsible for speakers and directors of federally funded bilingual vocational projects, by encouraging the designation of a State vocational education contact to serve as a liaison person, and by monitoring and providing technical assistance activities to the projects.

- To encourage new and continuing programs to incorporate the following objectives:

  --To use existing adult, vocational, and bilingual education networks such as the National Network for Curriculum Coordination of Vocational Technical Education and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, with particular emphasis on those which include State vocational and adult education department personnel.

  --To search for appropriate bilingual, vocational, and adult education curriculum materials to adapt or adopt. Many of these materials are available from the Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, or the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

  --To encourage grantees to document their own program improvement training efforts during the grant period, emphasizing "how-to" program improvement products that can be shared with State staff or other projects.

  --To increase the effectiveness of bilingual vocational training programs by strengthening the interrelationship between bilingual vocational training and instructor training programs.

  --To assure that applicants seeking grants or contracts to produce bilingual vocational materials, methods, and techniques build on work done under previous Federal contracts and that they consider developing materials for evaluating bilingual vocational education programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) made a smooth transition in taking over the administration of the three bilingual vocational education programs. The Carl D. Perkins Act mandated that the programs be located in OVAE; they had previously been administered by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served. In FY 1985, 24 student training projects totaling $2,395,900, were funded under bilingual vocational training. Project personnel recruited and trained 3,500 persons of limited English-speaking ability.Ten Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training programs were funded for a total of $921,500; they trained 275 instructors. Three materials development contracts were funded for a total of $363,000.

Types of Benefits Provided: Under the Bilingual Vocational Training Program, persons with limited English-speaking ability are trained for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers in environments where English is the language normally used. Under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program, participants receive training in vocational skills, in the methodology of bilingual education, and in job-placement techniques as well as job-related English-as-a-second-language instruction or other course work.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 AER for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Congress passed a new vocational education act, the Carl D. Perkins Act, on October 19, 1984, the beginning of FY 1985. The regulations for this Act became effective August 16, 1985. The major changes to the bilingual vocational education programs were their administrative transfer to the Office of Vocational and Adult Education from the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs and the change in funding to reach the three major programs.3/ The new regulations reflected these changes.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new information.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ron Castaldi, (202) 732-2369

Program Studies : Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, established an authorization of $735 million for this program under the Vocational Education Act, with no specific authorization for bilingual vocational training.

2. Section 183 of the Vocational Education Act, as amended, specified that available funds were to be divided among the three programs as follows:

   - o Sixty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Training Program (84.077).
   - o Twenty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program (84.099).
   - o Ten percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructional Materials, Methods, and Techniques Program (84.100).

3. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act changed the breakdown of funding among the three programs as follows:

   - o Seventy-five percent of funds for the Bilingual Vocational Training Program (84.077).
   - o Fifteen percent of funds for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program (84.099).
   - o Ten percent of funds for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructional Materials, Methods, and Techniques Program (84.100).

ADULT EDUCATION--GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.002)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-511, Section 101 (20 U.S.C. 1201) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1981

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$250,000,000	$100,000,000
1982	100,000,000	86,400,000
1983	100,000,000	95,000,000
1984	100,000,000	100,000,000
1985	140,000,000	101,963,000

Purpose: To expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will enable all adults to acquire the literacy and other basic skills necessary to function in society, to complete secondary school, and to profit from employment-related training.

Eligibility and Formula: The States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allotted funds according to the proportion of their adult population that lack a secondary school certificate and are not required to be in such schools, plus $150,000. Outlying Territories (Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) are allotted 1 percent or less of the appropriated funds. The States and Outlying Territories distribute funds to local education agencies (LEAs) or to other public or private, nonprofit agencies based on State-run competitions. The FY 1985 awards are forward-funded and dependent on FY 1984 rules. The FY 1984 rules reviewed earlier were changed in FY 1985 but program allocations will not be affected until FY 1986.

Services Provided by Recipient Agencies: LEAs or other agencies funded by the State provide training in basic skills or other services to persons 16 years of age or older, or who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance and are not high school graduates. Each State is required to match Federal funds at a rate of 10 cents for every 90 cents of Federal money received. (No match is required of Outlying Territories.) Each State must use at least 10 percent of its grant for special projects and teacher training. State grants also support programs for adults with limited English proficiency, for residents of urban areas with high unemployment rates, for residents of rural areas, and for institutionalized adults.

Annual financial and performance reports and the maintenance of records for audits are required of each grant recipient.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program,
- To disseminate information on effective practices,
- To improve service delivery to program participants, and
- To study ways of reducing adult illiteracy.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Data collection has not been required since FY 1981, except for summary financial reports. In FY 1986, the Adult Education Act has requested data collection on participants, programs, expenditures, and goals.
- The Clearinghouse on Adult Education, although no longer directly authorized, continues to disseminate information on effective practices. Seven adult education projects have been approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel through FY 1985 for their replicability and positive impact on participants.
- Networks have been established in support of competency-based adult education, adult secondary education, English as a second language, education for adults with disabilities, defense-related adult education, use of volunteers in education, and development of basic skills in business and industry.
- This program has improved the provision of support services, made scheduling more flexible, arranged convenient locations for classes, and encouraged the use of instructional materials and methodologies more appropriate to adult education.
- A study has confirmed that States have information suitable for a national evaluation. A cost-benefit model design study was completed and a pilot project was recommended. (E.2)

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: FY 1984 monies were distributed for use in FY 1985 as follows: (1) Outlying Territories received $1 million; (2) each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received a minimum of $150,000; and (3) the remainder was divided among the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico on the basis of the number of persons age 16 and over with less than a high school education, based on the 1980 Census. Thirty-two States had grants of more than $1 million, with the four largest grants going to California ($8,135,355), New York ($7,184,087), Texas ($6,231,341), and Pennsylvania ($5,003,792). The smallest State grant went to Alaska for $245,265. (E.1)

In FY 1984, States distributed about 58 percent of grant funds to local education agencies (LEAs), 21 percent to colleges and universities, 11 percent to intermediate education agencies, 5 percent to State agencies, and 5 percent to institutions and other agencies. These subgrants tended to be small, with about two-thirds being under $50,000. (E.1)

In FY 1984, 2.6 million adults participated in the program, about one-fourth of whom received instruction in English as a second language (ESL). More than 23,000 trained literacy volunteers served in basic education and English-as-a-second-language classes. Of these volunteers, 85 percent served as tutors on a one-to-one basis. (E.1)

States continued their efforts to improve the quality of instructional services through special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training projects. Projects trained administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Major program areas for special projects included English as a second language, adult performance level/life skills, employability, adults with disabilities, technology, and tutoring.

The majority of Federal funds were spent on various types of instructional activities through grants made by the States to local projects. All States are required to emphasize adult basic education programs. States must provide assurance that special assistance will be given to persons with limited English proficiency. ESL instruction is also a priority of the legislation.

Collection of demographic data from the States has not been required since FY 1981. Reports submitted voluntarily by States for the 1983-84 school year provide the following information:

Total number of participants:	2,596,544
Number of participants by Level:	
Level I participants (grades K-8 and ESL)	1,939,177
Level II participants (grades 9-12)	657,367

Program Effectiveness: In summarizing State performance reports, Federal program staff made the following findings:

- Approximately 80 percent of the participants are between 16 and 44 years old.

- Those benefiting from adult education, support services, and associated personnel development efforts included such groups as adults with limited English proficiency; adults in urban areas with high rates of unemployment; adults in rural areas; immigrant adults; and personnel such as administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

- Federal funds continue to serve as a catalyst to State and local support for services to educationally disadvantaged adults. Within the 20-year life of the program, resources have grown from the required 10 percent match to more than one dollar of State and local funds for every Federal dollar. In FY 1983, the last year for which data are available, State and local matching funds amounted to two-thirds of the total expenditures.

D. Highlights of Activities

- The 1978 amendments to the Adult Education Act took a major step toward making adult education more accessible and inviting to educationally disadvantaged adults. Narrative reports from the States indicate that the requirements to expand the program through the use of public and private agencies and organizations together with public school systems have increased and will continue to increase State and local support for and capability in adult education.

- Increased cooperation and coordination with other Federal programs are evolving. The Department of Education is working with the Department of Transportation to identify resources for meeting the transportation needs of disadvantaged adults. Disadvantaged adults needing basic education and training in occupational skills are being served through joint funding, cross referrals, and joint operation of vocational education, adult education, and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs. For example, last year, $10.2 million from JTPA funding was used at the local level to teach basic skills for occupational preparation and supportive services for disadvantaged youth and adults. The State reports show increased use of volunteers and an expansion in the private sector's capacity to help adults who need basic literacy skills.

- The National Council of State Directors of Adult Education, in cooperation with the Department, has sought to learn more about the connections between local basic education programs and business, industry, and unions by conducting a survey completed in April 1985. Thirty-one States reported formal affiliation with businesses or unions in their States. These 31 States work with more than 4,000 companies and unions, most of them medium size or small. Nearly 156,000 persons are served through these efforts. Instructional programs are predominantly adult basic and secondary education. Slightly fewer instructional programs are reported for employability/life skills and English as a second language.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual State reports.

2. Sherman, J.D. and Stromsdorfer, E.W. Model for Benefit-cost Analysis of Adult Education Programs, Pelavin Associates, Inc., 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417 (b)]

No studies are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul V. Delker, (202) 732-2270

Program Studies : James Maxwell, (202) 245-8364

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PELL (BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY) GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.063)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 411, P.L. 92-318, as amended (86 Stat., 247-251) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$2,604,000,000[1]
1982	"	2,419,040,000
1983	"	2,419,040,000
1984	"	2,800,000,000
1985	"	3,862,000,000[2]

Purpose: To help qualified students meet the costs of their undergraduate education at eligible institutions of higher education. The program is intended to improve access to postsecondary education for students demonstrating financial need.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The goal of the Pell Grant Program is to provide access to higher education to persons who might otherwise be denied access because of financial need. During FY 1985 the objectives were as follows:

- To establish rules for calculating financial need and distribute this information to institutions and students,
- To employ an application system that does not unduly burden applicants with complex forms and unnecessary delays,
- To monitor and control inaccurate or inappropriate information leading to disbursement of awards above or below the appropriate amount, and
- To maintain an equitable distribution of aid and maintain access to higher education for students in low-income families.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o Published modified regulations governing the analysis of need and the calculation of expected family contribution for the current program year.

- o Prepared and distributed Pell application forms following the published regulations from which all relevant information could be obtained with a minimum of difficulty. Studied the application/award procedures to determine the feasibility of increased automation in the Pell system, with the goal of reducing costs and processing time. The processing contractor handled applications from approximately 5.5 million students in academic year 1984-85 and produced eligibility reports in an effective and timely manner.

- o Conducted studies of errors on applications and developed a set of procedures to identify items likely to cause inaccurate award calculation.

- o Allowed the college enrollment rate of low-income students (family income under $10,000) to remain comparable with that of high-income students (over $30,000), reversing a decline in low-income enrollment from 1978 to 1981 (E.1).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Students Participating: Preliminary program data for academic year 1984-85 showed that a total of 5,514,096 persons applied, of which 3,546,397 were eligible (that is, the applicants did not have a family contribution amount above the prescribed limit). (In 1983-84, there were 5,453,548 applicants of which 3,541,191 were qualified.) Full recipient and award data are not available for 1984-85, but for 1983-84 there were 2,839,557 awards totaling $2,795,429,000, for an average award of $984 (E.2). Undergraduate enrollment was 10.8 million (E.3), so 26 percent of all undergraduates received a Pell grant in 1983-84.

Institutions Participating: The number of institutions participating in the Pell program continued to increase slightly. Institutions acting as the disbursing agent (regular disbursement system) increased from 5,032 in academic year 1982-83 to 5,139 in 1983-84, and those requesting the Office of Student Financial Assistance to act as the disbursing agent (alternate disbursement system) were up from 812 to 863 in this period (E.4).[3]

Program Effectiveness: Program data do not include the effects of other forms of financial support (except for expected family contribution) and do not contain racial information. Other sources of data, such as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), must be used to evaluate these factors. Although the annual CIRP survey covers only freshmen, it is very large (about 300,000 respondents) and available over a long period of time.

Table 1 shows data for first-time, full-time dependent freshmen surveyed by CIRP in academic years 1981-82 through 1984-85. The average awards are comparable with those obtained from overall program data (in academic year 1982-83, the CIRP average was $887, and the program average was $931; in academic year 1983-84, the CIRP average was $969, the program average, $984). The larger value in program data shows the effect of financially independent students who tend to receive larger Pell grants than dependent students.

Of interest in Table 1 is the declining share of educational cost covered by the Pell award. (Compare the 1981-82 overall average of 20.3 percent with the 1983-84 value of 18.3 percent.) This is the case in all individual income categories, but for the lowest income class (under $10,000), the percentage of cost covered by Pell may be leveling off, as shown by almost identical values in 1983-84 and 1984-85. Over all incomes, the decline in this factor indicates that costs of education have increased faster than the Pell awards.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM, BY FAMILY INCOME ACADEMIC YEARS 1981-82 TO 1984-85

		Family Income					
Year		Less Than $10,000	$10,000- $19,999	$20,000- $29,999	$30,000- $39,999	$40,000+	All Income Levels
1981-82	Average award	$1,016	$848	$703	$763	$864	$847
	% aided	60.0	44.9	24.9	12.2	5.2	26.5
	% of cost	26.1	20.5	16.1	16.5	17.9	20.3
1982-83	Average award	$1,094	$881	$727	$789	$917	$887
	% aided	59.7	47.1	23.6	10.9	4.9	24.1
	% of cost	23.4	18.3	14.8	15.5	15.8	17.3
1983-84	Average award	$1,148	$990	$812	$848	$937	$969
	% aided	66.0	51.1	27.5	13.5	6.6	27.3
	% of cost	22.9	19.2	15.3	15.4	14.8	19.4
1984-85	Average award	$1,158	$995	$771	$780	$939	$971
	% aided	58.5	46.1	22.5	7.7	2.4	21.2
	% of cost	23.0	19.0	13.8	13.0	14.7	18.3

Key: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = Average award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.5

Table 1 also shows a marked decrease in 1984-85 of the percentage of students receiving Pell grants, a return to the pattern of decline interrupted in 1983-84 by an increase to 27.3 percent ("All Income Levels" column of Table 1). This ratio has gone from 32.2 (1980-81) to 26.5 (81-82) to 24.1 (82-83) to 27.3 (83-84) and 21.2 (84-85). All except the figure for 1984-85 have been in agreement with program estimates for all undergraduates. Although full program data are not yet available for 1984-85, estimates of Pell participation through mid-year show less fall-off than was shown by equivalent partial data the previous year, and a continued rise in proprietary school recipients. The difference between CIRP and program data in the most recent year (1984-85) may be due to the increase in the independent/dependent recipient ratio and to the incompleteness of the program operation data. It is impossible to determine at this time if this discrepancy is serious.

The percentage of freshmen aided in academic year 1983-84 was 27.3 percent, which agrees very favorably with the program staff estimate of 26 percent of all undergraduates receiving Pell grants.

An interesting fact in the distribution of Pell funds is the marked growth of the share taken by proprietary schools over the same 5-year period. Table 2 shows authorization amounts and number of recipients for public, private, and proprietary schools. The proprietary share here nearly doubled in the period shown. The 1984-85 data are based on partial-year school reports.

Table 2

PELL GRANT DISTRIBUTION, BY INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

Authorizations

Academic Year	Public		Private		Proprietary	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
1980-81	$1,425,000,000	59.7	$687,000,000	28.8	$275,000,000	11.5
1981-82	1,367,000,000	59.5	622,000,000	27.1	310,000,000	13.5
1982-83	1,374,000,000	56.8	643,000,000	26.6	400,000,000	16.6
1983-84	1,579,000,000	56.5	687,000,000	24.6	527,000,000	18.9
1984-85*	1,706,000,000	56.1	699,000,000	23.0	636,000,000	20.9

Recipients

Academic Year	Public		Private		Proprietary	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1980-81	1,892,000	66.8	648,000	22.8	300,000	10.6
1981-82	1,824,000	65.6	618,000	22.2	337,000	12.1
1982-83	1,626,000	63.0	567,000	22.1	386,000	14.9
1983-84	1,773,000	62.3	579,000	20.3	494,000	17.4
1984-85*	1,793,000	61.5	568,000	19.4	556,000	19.1

Source: See E.4

*Preliminary data for partial-year program operations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3 shows the distribution of Pell grants for academic year 1984-85 to freshmen by race and sex (E.5). The difference in participation rates and mean award rates between men and women is not great. In general, the participation rates were higher for black students than for nonblack students, and grant sizes varied across income groups.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE PELL PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME FALL 1984

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	58.0	45.4	23.1	8.1	2.3	20.1
Average per recipient	$1,180	$1,009	$776	$773	$968	$972
Women						
participating	59.2	47.5	22.1	7.4	2.1	22.7
Average per recipient	$1,142	$984	$767	$787	$896	$970
Blacks						
% participating	62.7	58.1	37.7	15.2	6.9	44.2
Average per recipient	$1,252	$1,151	$946	$883	$955	$1,147
Nonblacks						
% participating	57.5	44.4	21.4	7.3	2.3	19.1
Average per recipient	$1,122	$961	$746	$766	$938	$931

Source: See E.5

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration has stressed the importance of parental and student contribution to meeting college costs before Federal student aid is considered. Currently, a student's need is calculated by the Department, using a set family contribution formula. The institution uses the family contribution figure to determine the amount of Federal aid the student will be awarded (such as grants, low-cost loans, and work-study funds), with any remaining need filled by parents or self-help. Under the Administration's policy, the amount of the family contribution and self-help would be calculated first, before the student qualifies for any grants.

The Department of Education is continuing to develop regulations for validating applicant data, using the results of quality control studies and external reports. The Department is also pursuing an evaluation of electronic delivery capability to reduce the time to process corrections to students' applications and awards and to improve the accuracy of the procedure. This system would make it much easier to verify Pell awards. Both the new regulations and the electronic delivery system could significantly reduce fraud and abuse in the distribution of Pell grants. However, a recent study by the General Accounting Office indicates that the current validation procedures may not be very cost-effective. New approaches (E.7) to the solution of the overaward/underaward problem may be needed.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. October school enrollment surveys, 1978 to 1983, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.
2. "Pell Grant Management Analysis Report," U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Division of Program Operations, August 1985.
3. "Condition of Education," 1985 edition, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
4. Program Files, September 1985, The Division of Program Operations.
5. "Annual Survey of Freshmen," Academic Years 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the Higher Education Research Institute.
6. "Institutional Agreement and Authorization Reports," July 1985, Pell Grant Program.
7. "Report to the Honorable Paul Simon, United States Senate," General Accounting Office, GAO/PEMD-85-10, September 27, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A major survey of student financial aid is being planned by the National Center for Education Statistics in cooperation with the Office of Student Financial Assistance and other Federal agencies. This survey will collect data on both recipients and nonrecipients of aid, providing a large sample of the student population on which detailed analysis of aid patterns can be based.

The CIRP annual freshman survey is being supplemented by a followup study of students 2 and 4 years after their freshman year. This should provide valuable data on dropout rates and on the differences between freshmen and higher-level undergraduates in the pattern of aid receipt.

A study of the requirements phase establishing patterns of information study for a management information system is being carried out by Advanced Technology, Inc., under a contract with the Department of Education. This will lead to development of a system for using data on aid recipients to evaluate program operations.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Joseph A. Vignone, (202) 472-4300

Program Studies : Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Includes $150 million budget reduction and a $451 million supplemental appropriation. Of the total amount, the Department of Education drew down $258 million for FY 1980. The total amount available for awards was $2,309,856,000.

2. Includes $250 million allocated by FY 1985 appropriation, $400 million reallocated on March 29, 1985, to academic year 1983-84, and a supplement appropriation of $287 million. The total amount available for awards was $3,212,000,000.

3. Under the regular disbursement system, the Department of Education distributes funds to the school; under the alternate disbursement system, schools certify a student's eligibility and the Department of Education distributes funds directly to the student.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.007)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 P.L. 89-329, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1070b) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$350,000,000 1/	$370,000,000
1982	370,000,000 2/	355,400,000
1983	370,000,000 2/	355,400,000
1984	370,000,000 2/	375,000,000
1985	370,000,000 3/	412,500,000

Purpose: To help needy undergraduate students meet educational expenses exceeding the amount of their family support. Of the two types of grants under the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) Program, initial-year grants are for students who have not previously received a SEOG, while continuing-year grants are for students who have received a SEOG before. Funding for initial-year grants is allocated separately from funding for continuing grants, but institutions have the option of transferring funds between the two programs.

Funding: The Department of Education allocates SEOG funds to institutions according to a statutory formula and program regulations. Aggregate institutional funding for each State cannot be less than the State's allotment as determined by a separate statutory formula. Institutions distribute grants to students, each institution having the option of transferring up to 10 percent of its funds in the SEOG program to the Work-Study Program.

Institutional Eligibility: Institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for participation in the SEOG Program. The Department of Education allocates funds to the institutions based on a "conditional guaranteed minimum" plus increases based on their "fair share" of total State and national apportionments. No institution may receive less than its 1979 allocation.

Student Eligibility: Students in participating institutions of higher education are eligible to receive a SEOG if they demonstrate financial need, are maintaining satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institution, meet citizen/resident requirements, do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, and are not in default on a Title IV loan. Institutions allocate grants to students on the basis of financial need, subject to the availability of funds. The academic year maximum SEOG is $2,000 and the minimum is $200. Institutions may distribute up to 10 percent of their SEOG allocations to students who are enrolled less than half-time.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To encourage institutional participation in the SEOG program, in order to increase the number of students having access to this form of aid, and
- To establish and disseminate standard needs analysis criteria and to approve equivalent institutional analysis formulas so that all students will have equal opportunity to participate.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The SEOG Program has had a net increase of approximately 125 participating institutions a year (mostly proprietary) since 1978. In academic year 1985-86, approximately 4,446 institutions will share in the appropriation distributed by the Department of Education.
- The Department published tables of expected family contribution and limits for approved institutional needs analysis systems in the Code of Federal Regulations.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The program staff reported that 640,652 students received grants in academic year 1982-83, the latest year for which data are complete, a drop from 658,893 in 1981-82. In academic year 1982-83, the average grant award amount was $535, down slightly from $549 in 1981-82 (E.1). Preliminary estimates for the program in 1983-84 indicate that the recipient and award levels changed only slightly from 1982-83. Final figures should be available soon. Data on first-time, full-time freshmen participants in the SEOG Program are shown in Table 1, covering the academic years from 1981-82 to 1984-85. Between academic years 1981-82 and 1982-83, participation declined from 6.60 percent to 5.87 percent, but average awards increased from $687 to $772. Only full-time freshmen are shown in Table 1, whereas program data include all classes and half-time students.

In 1983-84, the SEOG participation rate among first-time, full-time dependent freshmen rose to 7.2 percent, but in 1984-85 the rate again fell back to the 1982-83 level of 5.9 percent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN SEOG, BY FAMILY INCOME, ACADEMIC YEARS 1981-82 TO 1984-85

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	All Income Levels
1981-82	Average award	$730	$669	$649	$714	$781	$687
	% aided	15.5	11.2	6.2	2.8	1.1	6.6
	% of cost	17.2	14.4	13.2	13.8	15.7	14.8
1982-83	Average award	$768	$709	$673	$729	$816	$772
	% aided	15.1	11.0	5.7	3.0	1.1	5.9
	% of cost	16.4	14.7	13.7	14.4	14.1	14.1
1983-84	Average award	$793	$757	$725	$780	$894	$769
	% aided	17.6	13.1	7.4	3.8	1.6	7.2
	% of cost	15.8	14.7	13.7	14.2	14.1	13.4
1984-85	Average award	$854	$772	$775	785	$908	$801
	% aided	13.4	11.3	6.8	3.7	1.2	5.9
	% of cost	14.5	12.3	11.3	10.9	12.7	12.4

Key: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = (Average award ÷ average cost)

Source: See E.2

Program Effectiveness: The equitable distribution of SEOG funds can be assessed by determining how the distribution varies with measures of ability to pay. These may be individually oriented (e.g., family income for students) or group oriented (e.g., median income or average need within a State). Ideally, funds distributed should reflect ability to pay and cost of education.

Although originally targeted only at the neediest students, the SEOG Program now applies to all students with any demonstrated financial need. Need analysis formulas consider income, family size, assets, and unusual expenses as factors in the ability to pay for education. Costs of education include tuition and fees, transportation, room and board, books, and miscellaneous expenses. Reports of fiscal operations from institutions show how grant recipients vary by income level. Although this program report, Table 2, uses income ranges different from those in Table 1, it shows that both recipients and funds vary fairly uniformly even across the three lowest income categories.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SEOG RECIPIENTS AND FUNDS, BY FAMILY INCOME, 1982-83[4] AWARD YEAR

	Family Income						
Participation	Under $6,000	$ 6,000-11,999	$12,000-17,999	$18,000-23,999	$24,000-29,999	$30,000+	Independents* and less than 1/2 time
% SEOG Recipients	12.80	13.04	13.06	11.24	8.72	8.68	32.46
% SEOG funds	10.97	12.78	13.93	12.44	9.90	10.19	29.79

*Independent students are usually in the lowest income group.

Source: See E.1

Effectiveness

The average grant size shown in Table 1 has risen, but the rate of growth is not keeping pace with increases in education costs. The fraction of cost covered by a SEOG from academic year 1981-82 to 1984-85 is declining across all income groups. As a result, students must supply an increasing proportion of costs through family contributions, work, and other sources of aid.

The 1983-84 distribution of SEOG awards to first-time, full-time students by race/ethnicity and sex is shown in Table 3. Black participation rates are higher, at all income levels, than nonblack rates of participation. Average awards also are higher except at the highest income level ($40,000+). There is less difference in participation rates and average grant sizes between men and women than between blacks and nonblacks, although there are somewhat more women at a lower average grant than men.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE SEOG PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1984

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,000	$40,000+	All Income Levels
Men						
% participating	13.3	10.9	7.1	3.7	1.3	5.7
Average per recipient	$863	$794	$756	$816	$934	$811
Women						
% participating	13.5	11.7	6.5	3.9	1.1	6.3
Average per recipient	$848	$755	$795	$755	$871	$792
Blacks						
rticipating	16.0	15.8	12.1	7.0	3.7	12.6
age per recipient	$929	$820	$872	$900	$676	$869
Nonblacks						
% participating	12.5	10.6	6.4	3.6	1.1	5.3
Average per recipient	$820	$758	$759	$771	$937	$784

Source: See E.2

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration proposed to terminate the SEOG Program as part of a new self-help approach, which would also include an increase in Pell grants for the neediest students.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Unpublished tables from Campus-Based Analysis Section, Fall 1983, Office of Student Financial Assistance, U.S. Department of Education, 1982-83 Campus-Based Programs.

2. Annual Survey of Freshmen 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Secondary data analysis by the Planning and Evaluation Service, Student and Institutional Aid Division.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A major survey of student financial aid is being planned by the National Center for Education Statistics in cooperation with the Office of Student Financial Assistance and other Federal agencies. This survey will collect data on recipients and nonrecipients of aid, providing a large sample of the student population on which detailed analysis of aid patterns can be based.

The CIRP annual freshman survey is being supplemented with a followup study of students 2 and 4 years after their freshman year. This study should provide valuable data on dropout patterns of various levels of undergraduate school and on the differences between freshman and higher-level undergraduates in the pattern of aid receipt.

A study of the preliminary data definition phase of a management information system is being carried out by Advanced Technology, Inc. under a contract with the Department's Information Resources Management Service (IRMS). This will lead to development of a system for using data on aid recipients to evaluate program operations.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Initial-year authorization only, no continuing allocation authorized in FY 1980 and FY 1981.
2. P.L. 92-35, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.
3. Authorization for this additional year beyond the statutory expiration in FY 1984 is provided by General Education Provision Act legislation.
4. This is a revised and improved version of the data in the 1984 AER. The 1983-84 data are not available because of a cutback in data processing funds.

STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.069)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Section 415A to 415D P.L. 92-318, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1070c to 1070C-3) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$100,000,000	$76,750,000
1982	76,800,000	73,680,000
1983	76,800,000	60,000,000
1984	76,800,000	76,000,000
1985	76,800,000	76,000,000

Purpose: To help States develop and expand grant assistance to students attending postsecondary educational institutions.

State Eligibility: All States are eligible to receive Federal formula grants, which must be matched with at least equal funds from State resources. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) agencies encourage States to develop additional sources of grant assistance to needy students in postsecondary education. In 35 States, Federal SSIG funds are overmatched by at least three to one. In 14 of the remaining States, SSIG accounts for 50 percent of State grant assistance.

Student Eligibility: To be eligible for one of these grants, an undergraduate must be attending a public, private non-profit, or (at State option) proprietary school; must meet citizen/resident requirements; and must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, or be in default on a Title IV loan. At State option, graduate and less-than-half-time students may also be eligible. All non-profit institutions are eligible to participate, except where they are excluded by the State constitution or by a State law enacted prior to October 1978.

Administrative Agencies: Under Section 1203 of the Higher Education Act, each State designates an agency to be responsible for these funds. It may be part of the State government, an Education Department or division dealing with higher education, the organization managing other State grant or loan programs, or a designated corporation acting for the State. The agency receives Federal SSIG funds, matches them at least dollar for dollar with State funds, and distributes them to eligible students in the State student aid program.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Continuing objectives of this program in FY 1985 were as follows:

- To deliver student aid dollars to qualified recipients and maintain the level of State allotments,
- To encourage States to increase support of grant programs for needy students, and
- To insure the existence of State agencies concerned with the distribution of grant aid to needy students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Federal SSIG appropriation of $76 million in FY 1984 has been maintained in FY 1985.
- The total State need-based grant support, including overmatching of SSIG funds, increased from $1,016,644,000 in program year 1982-83 to $1,080,838,000 in 1983-84. Federal SSIG allotments represent about 6 percent of the overall State need-based grant effort. In 12 States that did not have grant programs before SSIG, State funds now provide more than a 50-50 match of the Federal allotment. All States now participate in SSIG.1/
- SSIG staff have explored the establishment of Student Assistance Service Centers to improve the delivery of aid to students in small institutions. Cooperative programs with private industries have been developed.2/

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In program year 1984-85, Federal funds of $76 million matched 50-50 for a total of $152 million were distributed to approximately 304,000 recipients, with awards averaging $577. Almost $1.2 billion in need based grants was distributed by States. The average award for all State grants in the 1984-85 academic year was $909. SSIG accounted for about six percent of all 1984-85 State aid dollars (E.I).

Table 1 shows that in the 1983-84 program year, public 4-year institutions received 41 percent of Federal SSIG funds and accounted for 50 percent of all recipients. Private 4-year institutions received 43 percent of Federal SSIG funds but had only 30 percent of all recipients. Two-year and proprietary institutions accounted for the remaining 16 percent of funds and 20 percent of recipients.

Program Effectiveness: SSIG data through the 1983-84 program year indicate that the size of the average SSIG award declined from $556 in 1980-81 to $545 in 1981-82 and $528 in 1982-83, and then increased to $577 in 1983-84. Awards to students from families with incomes over $20,000 increased steadily from 17.9 to 23.0 percent, probably due to wage inflation. Information on the distribution of all State grants (including SSIG funds) for first-time, full-time students (Table 2) reflects a similar trend of increasing average award levels. However, the percentage of costs covered by State grants decreased over this period, due to high inflation of college costs. This was true for all first-time, full-time dependent students from all income levels from 1981-82 to 1984-85.

Table 1

SSIG DISTRIBUTION FOR SELECTED YEARS

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Average student award (includes State match)	$556	$545	$528	$577
Percentage of all SSIG recipients at:				
4-year public institutions	49.3	53.2	51.8	50.5
4-year private institutions	32.8	25.1	24.1	29.6
Proprietary	2.0	1.7	2.1	2.1
2-year institutions	16.0	20.0	21.9	17.8
Percentage of all Federal SSIG funds at:				
4-year public institutions	39.5	43.6	43.1	41.0
4-year private institutions	45.3	39.9	36.5	43.4
Proprietary	2.5	2.1	2.4	2.0
2-year institutions	12.7	14.5	18.0	13.7
Percentage of all Federal SSIG Dollars to Recipients with incomes of $20,000+	19.9	18.2	19.4	23.0

Source: E.2

Table 1 indicates little change in the distribution of awards to public colleges while Table 2 suggests that, except for 1983-84, the relative number of students aided by the program has remained roughly at a level of one in six.

Finally, despite the fact that SSIG program funding has remained essentially the same over the FY 1981 to FY 1985 period, need-based State grant programs as a whole have risen from $836 million in 1981-82 to $1,195 million in 1984-85, an increase of 22 percent (E.1). Overall State funding for higher education during this period increased 16 percent (E.4). This reflects an increasing responsibility and willingness of the States to fund student aid programs.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN STATE GRANT PROGRAMS, BY FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1981 to 1984

Academic Year		Family Income UNDER $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average For All Recipients
1981-82	Average award	$802	$687	$690	$765	$779	$726
	% aided	24.6	22.9	15.9	10.2	5.7	15.1
	% of cost	18.5	15.0	14.7	16.0	16.3	15.8
1982-83	Average award	$789	$704	$678	$735	$725	$718
	% aided	28.2	25.2	17.7	10.7	5.9	15.6
	% of cost	16.8	14.6	13.8	14.5	12.5	14.0
1983-84	Average award	$834	$780	$736	$821	$831	$789
	% aided	29.2	27.3	19.3	11.9	7.2	17.0
	% of cost	16.6	15.1	13.9	15.0	13.1	14.1
1984-85	Average award	$867	$812	$750	$752	$973	$793
	% aided	25.9	25.5	18.6	11.1	6.6	15.4
	% of cost	14.9	13.5	11.9	11.7	12.3	12.9

KEY: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = Average Award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.3

Table 3 portrays the distribution of State grants to first-time, full-time dependent freshmen by race, sex, and family income for the fall of 1984. It indicates that women have slightly higher participation rates and lower average awards in all but the lowest income group.

Overall black participation in State grant programs is lower than nonblack participation, and the average awards in the two groups are significantly different: $1,018 for blacks and $772 for nonblack students. At the highest income level, black students participate at a greater rate than nonblack students, while at all other levels the reverse is true.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN STATE GRANTS[1] FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, FALL 1984, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME

	Family Income					
Participation	UNDER $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	26.9	25.0	17.9	10.7	6.6	14.7
Average per recipient	$855	$815	$762	$811	$805	$805
Women						
% participating	25.2	26.2	19.5	11.7	6.7	16.3
Average per recipient	$876	$810	$738	$717	$736	$781
Blacks						
% participating	17.9	18.6	14.5	9.8	6.8	14.5
Average per recipient	$1,038	$929	$1,097	$998	$1,207	$1,018
Nonblacks						
% participating	28.8	27.0	19.1	11.3	6.7	15.6
Average per recipient	$831	$798	$730	$752	$755	$772

Source: See E.1

D. Highlights of Activities

Project-monitoring activities for this program included audits performed in accordance with OMB Circular A-102. As a result of the Single Audit Act of 1984, OMB Circular A-128 will be used for audits performed for FY 1985-86.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. K. Richer and J. Davis, National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Program, 16 Annual Survey Report, 1984-85 Academic Year, January 1985.

2. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) Data Summary Reports, SSIG Program files, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 1985.

3. Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81 through 1984-85, Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute; unpublished tables derived by the Planning and Evaluation Service of the Department of Education, 1985.

4. M.M. Chambers, Appropriation, State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the SSIG program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Neil C. Nelson, (202) 472-4265

Program Studies : Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. State grants include Federal SSIG allotments plus required State matching funds and in many cases, an overmatch from State funds.

2. For example, State agencies have developed additional funding sources by establishing cooperative programs with private industry, and they have implemented work-study programs with private organizations.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.032)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV-B, P.L. 89-329 as amended (20 U.S.C. 1071-1087-3a) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Loan Volume[1]/	Obligations[2]/	Appropriation
1981	$7,824,000,000	$2,721,115,000	$2,535,470,000
1982	6,238,000,000	3,297,776,000	3,073,846,000
1983	6,928,000,000	2,942,072,000	3,100,500,000
1984	7,916,000,000	3,478,000,000	2,256,500,000
1985	9,267,000,000	4,732,554,703	4,106,454,703

Purpose: To facilitate students' access to postsecondary education and to enhance their choices among a broader range of institutions. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP) authorizes low-interest loans to students to help pay students' costs of attending eligible postsecondary institutions, including colleges and universities; vocational, technical, business, and trade schools; and certain foreign institutions.

Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS) serve the same general purpose as GSLP loans. PLUS makes loans to parents of dependent undergraduates, and to graduate and independent undergraduate students. These loans are less subsidized than regular GSLP loans, and repayment begins within 60 days of the loan disbursement.

Eligibility: U.S. citizens, nationals, and permanent residents in the United States for other than a temporary purpose may apply for a GSL if they are enrolled or accepted for enrollment on at least a half-time basis as undergraduate, graduate, professional, or vocational students at a participating postsecondary school. A student who is already enrolled at a participating institution must be maintaining satisfactory progress. Also, the student must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant or be in default on a Title IV loan. If the student's or the family's adjusted gross income is $30,000 or more, the student/family must undergo a "needs test" to determine eligibility for Federal payment of interest on the student's behalf while the student is in school.

PLUS: Parents and eligible students generally can obtain loans on the same basis as parents and students borrowing under regular GSLP provisions. An important exception is that there is no needs test on income, although lenders may restrict loans or loan amounts according to the borrower's creditworthiness.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal operating objectives for this program were as follows:

- o To develop, and have published in the Federal Register, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on the GSLP and PLUS programs; and
- o To develop procedures, in conjunction with the Internal Revenue Service, to offset income tax refunds of borrowers who are in default on their loans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department of Education developed and published in the Federal Register on September 4, 1985, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that combined the GSL and PLUS programs.
- o The Department of Education began developing procedures to make deductions from income tax refunds of borrowers who have defaulted on their loans.
- o The Department of Education sent letters to borrowers under the discontinued Federally Insured Student Loan Program (FISLP) informing them of the Department's intent to make deductions from the borrowers' income tax refunds if they have defaulted on their loan.

C. Costs and Benefits

Student Participation: The Department of Education estimates that about 31 percent of all eligible students participate in the GSLP. For full-time freshman undergraduates for the fall of 1984, the participation rate was 26.2 percent. (See Table 1 for more detail.) Participation rates and average loan amounts are sensitive primarily to the cost of education. For the lowest cost category (less than $3,000), the average participation rate in academic year 1984-85 was 10.8 percent. For the highest cost category (more than $6,000), 35.5 percent of all students borrowed under this program. Although a smaller percentage of students in the lowest cost schools participated, student loans paid for a larger percentage of their total costs. For example, in academic year 1983-84, loans covered 65.2 percent of total cost in the least expensive category of institution, but paid for only 24.7 percent of total cost in the highest cost category. However, the average loan at the highest cost schools was about 20 percent larger than that in the lowest cost schools. Because of the annual borrowing limit ($2,500), undergraduate students attending progressively more expensive institutions find that guaranteed loans meet a smaller percentage of their total costs (E.1). Individual data on the PLUS program are not yet available.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, DEPENDENT STUDENTS OF DIFFERING INCOME LEVELS IN GSL
ACADEMIC YEARS 1981-82 to 1984-85

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
1981-82	Average award	$1,557	$1,719	$1,927	$2,048	$2,161	$1,930
	% aided	18.5	25.4	30.4	30.7	25.6	27.0
	% of cost	34.9	38.1	42.8	44.5	42.4	41.5
1982-83	Average award	$1,636	$1,704	$1,833	$1,782	$1,830	$1,771
	% aided	24.0	27.6	27.6	23.5	11.8	22.4
	% of cost	34.9	35.4	37.4	35.1	31.6	34.5
1983-84	Average award	$1,631	$1,740	$1,841	$1,817	$1,846	$1,791
	% aided	25.4	27.8	29.3	25.3	13.0	23.4
	% of cost	32.5	33.7	34.8	33.0	29.1	31.7
1984-85	Average award	$1,772	$1,866	$1,950	$1,962	$1,970	$1,919
	% aided	28.9	31.6	33.2	28.8	15.3	26.2
	% of cost	30.9	31.7	32.8	31.0	28.1	31.1

Key: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = Average award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.1

Program Scope

GSLP: The Department of Education estimates that FY 1985 loan volume totaled about $8.7 billion, compared with $7.5 billion in FY 1984. In FY 1985, 3.7 million students received loans, compared with 3.3 million in 1984.

PLUS/Auxiliary: The Department of Education estimates that FY 1985 PLUS loans totaled $545 million, while in FY 1984 this component of the program was $369 million. About 204,000 persons participated in the PLUS program in FY 1985, compared with 140,000 in FY 1984.

For both program components, the cumulative outstanding loan volume is estimated at $37.2 billion in FY 1985, compared with $32.0 billion in FY 1984.

Table 2 displays these data for FY 1983 through FY 1985.

Table 2

SUMMARY OF LOAN VOLUME AND NUMBERS OF RECIPIENTS
FISCAL YEARS 1983, 1984, AND 1985

	1983	1984	1985
Regular Loans			
Loan volume	$6,671,000,000	$7,547,000,000	$8,722,000,000
Number of loans	2,939,000	3,263,000	3,697,000
Average loan	$2,269	$2,313	$2,359
PLUS Loans			
Loan volume	$257,100,000	$369,000,000	$545,000,000
Number of loans	100,000	140,000	204,000
Average loan	$2,571	$2,632	$2,675
Total			
Loan volume	$6,928,000,000	$7,916,000,000	$9,267,000,000
Number of loans	3,039,000	3,403,000	3,901,000
Average loan	$2,279	$2,326	$2,376
Cumulative Outstanding Loan Volume	$26,967,000,000	$31,903,000,000	$37,193,000,000

Source: See E.2

Program Effectiveness: During recent years, the Department has applied a needs test to loan applicants from families with adjusted gross incomes of $30,000 and above. Overall participation rates fell from 27 percent in 1981-82 to 22.4 percent in 1982-83, but by 1984-85 they had risen again to 26.2 percent (see Table 1). Participation by students in the highest income category--those most affected by the needs analysis restriction--dropped from 25.6 percent in 1981-82 to 11.8 percent in 1982-83, but by 1984-85 their participation had risen again to 15.3 percent.

The average amount borrowed has increased steadily, in line with the cost of living, for borrowers in all income categories. The average loan for all borrowers was $1,771 in academic year 1982-83 but had increased to $1,919 in 1984-85. This represented an increase of a little more than 4 percent per year. The greatest increase in size of average loan was for borrowers in the $30,000-$39,999 category. Over the 2-year period 1982-83 through 1984-85, their average loan increased from $1,782 to $1,962, an annual increase of about 5 percent.

There is currently no needs test for borrowers with family incomes of less than $30,000. Data in Table 1 show that participation rates for this group continued to increase between academic years 1982-83 and 1984-85. For example, of those in the lowest income category (less than $10,000), 24.0 percent borrowed in 1982-83 and 28.9 percent borrowed in 1984-85. Corresponding rates for the $10,000-$19,999 category were 27.6 percent and 31.6 percent, respectively, and for the $20,000-$29,999 category, 27.6 percent and 33.2 percent.

Guaranteed student loans covered a smaller percentage of the total cost of education in academic year 1984-85 than in earlier years. For the lowest income students (below $10,000), the average loan amount decreased from 34.9 percent of total cost in 1982-83 to 30.9 percent in 1984-85. All other income groups experienced similar decreases. For all borrowers, guaranteed loans amounted to 34.5 percent of total cost in 1982-83 but only 31.1 percent in 1984-85.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE GSL PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1984

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000 $19,999	$20,000 $29,999	$30,000 $39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	30.2	32.6	33.3	28.9	15.5	26.3
Average per recipient	$1,790	$1,870	$1,938	$1,957	$1,965	$1,919
Women						
% participating	28.1	31.1	33.4	29.2	15.5	26.5
Average per recipient	$1,758	$1,862	$1,963	$1,967	$1,976	$1,918
Black						
% participating	26.8	28.4	33.1	26.8	20.5	27.5
Average per recipient	$1,762	$1,798	$1,844	$1,896	$1,870	$1,816
Nonblacks						
% participating	29.7	32.5	33.4	29.2	15.3	26.3
Average per recipient	$1,775	$1,876	$1,958	$1,966	$1,977	$1,929

Source: See E.1

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department continued to increase its efforts to collect on outstanding defaults and to reduce the incidence of default in FY 1985. The Department plans for FY 1986 include the following:

- work extensively on reauthorization, and have the Department's debt collection proposals enacted.
- devote a considerable amount of time and effort to finalizing the NPRM on GSL collections and issuing a final rule.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1983.
2. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1981-84.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

One study is in progress, another is planned:

- The CIRP survey referred to in Section II E.1 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1985-86 academic year will be available in spring of 1986.
- The Department is planning a National Study of Student Financial Aid for the fall of 1986. It will survey students, parents, and institutions for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: David Bayer, (202) 245-2475

Program Studies : Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. All volume figures represent commitments rather than disbursements.
2. Represents total obligations incurred. Amounts have not been adjusted to reflect program receipts (collections on defaulted loans, insurance premiums, etc.).

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.038)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part E, P.L. 89-329 as amended (20 U.S.C. 1087aa-1087ii) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$400,000,000	$200,800,000
1982	286,000,000	193,360,000
1983	286,000,000	193,360,000
1984	286,000,000	180,860,000
1985	625,000,000	215,000,000

Purpose: To help institutions make low-interest loans to financially needy students to help pay their costs of attending postsecondary education institutions. The Direct Loan Program is the loan component of the "campus-based programs," which are directly administered by financial aid administrators at postsecondary institutions. Direct Loans provide flexibility to financial aid administrators in packaging student aid awards to best meet individual student needs.

Eligibility: Postsecondary institutions meeting eligibility requirements may participate. The Department of Education establishes an institutional revolving fund financed from repayment of previous loans, from the annual Federal Capital Contribution appropriated by Congress. The Department allocates appropriated funds to the States according to a statutory formula, and then to institutions according to both statutory requirements and program regulations.

If the Direct Loan Program appropriation exceeds the FY 1981 appropriation of $186 million, the State allotment formula uses the ratio of full-time enrollees in institutions of higher education within the State to the total number of such persons enrolled in all the States for 90 percent of the funding. If necessary, the Department apportions additional funds to a State to make its amount equal to that for FY 1972.

Students are eligible for a loan if (1) they are enrolled on at least a half-time basis and are making satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institutions, or (2) they have been accepted for enrollment for at least half-time at an eligible institution, and are United States citizens or are in the U.S. for other than a temporary purpose and intend to become permanent residents, do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, and are not in default on a Title IV loan. Direct Loan applicants must demonstrate financial need as determined by one of the approved systems to analyze need.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department of Education's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To increase collections of defaulted loans assigned to the Department by institutions, and
- To encourage institutions to collect loans more effectively and thus make more loan funds available to students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Institutions turned over to the Department of Education more defaulted loans for collection, and collections of them have subsequently increased: in FY 1983, commercial agencies under contract to the Department collected $20.0 million in defaulted loans, an increase of 77 percent over the FY 1982 figure of $11.3 million.
- The Department strengthened the "due diligence" requirements that institutions must meet in carrying out their collection activities.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1983, Direct Loan volume totaled $596.8 million; there were approximately 675,000 borrowers. The Department of Education allocated the FY 1984 Federal Capital Contribution of $160 million among the 3,348 participating institutions. Private universities and 4-year institutions received 44 percent ($70.4 million) while private 2-year colleges received 3 percent ($4.8 million). Public universities and four-year institutions received 33 percent ($52.8 million) and public 2-year colleges, 6 percent ($9.6 million). Borrowers attending proprietary schools received about 14 percent ($22.4 million) (see E.1).

Student Participation: During academic year 1984-85, about 7 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the Direct Loan Program, compared with about 6.7 percent in 1982-83. These rates generally vary in relation to both family income and educational cost: the higher the family income, the lower the participation rate; the higher the cost, the higher the participation rate (see Table 1). In 1984-85, for example, participation rates were highest (10.7 percent) for those in the two lowest income categories (under $10,000 and $10,000-$19,999) and lowest (2.3 percent) for those in the highest income group ($40,000+). This pattern has been consistent for many years.

The Direct Loan first-time, full-time freshmen borrowed an average of $1,238 during the most recent year. The amount borrowed varies principally with educational cost. For example, during 1984-85, students attending the lowest cost institutions (under $3,000) borrowed an average of $827. Those attending the most expensive institutions (more than $6,000) borrowed an average of $1,316, nearly 60 percent more.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM BY FAMILY INCOME, ACADEMIC YEARS 1981-82 TO 1984-85

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
1981-82	Average award	$922	$1,045	$1,169	$1,367	$1,672	$1,161
	% aided	10.5	11.9	9.7	6.4	2.9	8.2
	% of cost	20.0	22.6	24.5	28.2	33.0	24.4
1982-83	Average award	$973	$1,084	$1,166	$1,219	$1,354	$1,138
	% aided	10.0	10.7	8.4	5.4	2.0	6.7
	% of cost	20.8	22.5	23.8	24.0	23.4	22.2
1983-84	Average award	$1,027	$1,086	$1,179	$1,260	$1,347	$1,158
	% aided	11.5	11.3	9.2	6.4	2.5	7.4
	% of cost	20.4	21.0	22.3	22.8	21.2	19.6
1984-85	Average award	$1,064	$1,173	$1,269	$1,329	$1,426	$1,238
	% aided	10.7	10.7	9.6	6.2	2.3	7.0
	% of cost	17.1	18.6	20.0	19.9	20.3	19.2

Key: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = Average award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.2

Program Effectiveness: One measure of program effectiveness is the extent to which Direct Loans met total college costs during the most recent period compared with previous periods.

Student aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of total cost during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. During academic year 1984-85, for example, the average Direct Loan met 19.2 percent of the total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen, whereas in 1982-83, the average Direct Loan met 22.2 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the Direct Loan percentage of total cost shows little variation across family income categories. For example, an average Direct Loan met 17.1 percent of total cost for students from families having incomes of less than $9,999, and 20.3 percent of total cost for students with family incomes of $40,000 or more.

Table 1 shows the distribution of Direct Loans to full-time freshmen with different family incomes and costs of education as well as the average loan amount and the percentage of total cost met by these loans. Table 2 provides the distribution to students by family income, race, and sex. The data indicate that women as a whole had higher rates of participation but their loan amounts were almost the same as those for men. Greater proportions of blacks than whites borrowed, but the blacks borrowed substantially smaller amounts. The comparisons vary somewhat by income but are generally consistent.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION IN THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, Fall 1984

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,000	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
participating	10.5	9.9	9.1	5.8	2.3	6.5
Average per recipient	$1,058	$1,153	$1,261	$1,328	$1,402	$1,234
Women						
% participating	10.9	11.5	10.2	6.7	2.4	7.7
Average per recipient	$1,068	$1,188	$1,276	$1,329	$1,452	$1,242
Blacks						
% participating	9.8	10.5	11.6	6.6	3.7	9.2
Average per recipient	$1,027	$1,277	$1,357	$1,332	$1,419	$1,229
Nonblacks						
% participating	11.0	10.9	9.5	6.2	2.3	6.9
Average per recipient	$1,072	$1,157	$1,200	$1,328	$1,426	$1,239

Source: See E.2

D. Highlights of Activities

Increased efforts will be made to reduce outstanding defaults in the Direct Loan Program by strengthening institutional due-diligence requirements and by intensifying collection activities. These efforts, if successful, will result in the availability of more funds for new loans.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

2. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

One study is in progress and another is planned:

- The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 was repeated in the fall of 1985. It includes annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen of different race and sex and the report will be ready in the spring of 1986.

- The Department is planning a National Study of Student Financial Aid for the fall of 1986. It will survey students, parents, and institutions for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Daniel Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.033)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part C, P.L. 89-329 as amended (42 U.S.C. 2751-2756b) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$670,000,000	$550,000,000
1982	550,000,000	528,000,000
1983	590,000,000	590,000,000
1984	555,000,000	555,000,000
1985	830,000,000	592,500,000

Purpose: To stimulate and promote part-time employment for postsecondary students who need the earnings to help meet the cost of their education. Federal grants to institutions are used to subsidize up to 80 percent of a student's wages. The remainder is provided by the employer, which may be the institution itself if it is a nonprofit institution.

Authorization for Work-Study Programs also provides for job location and development projects intended to foster the location and development of part-time employment. Up to 10 percent of the Work-Study grant, not to exceed $25,000, may be used to support these projects.

Eligibility: Most public or nonprofit institutions or organizations may participate as employers. Funds are allotted among the States according to a statutory formula and then allocated to institutions under both statutory requirements and program regulations.

Undergraduate, graduate, or professional students (enrolled or accepted for enrollment as regular students) who are maintaining satisfactory academic progress in accordance with the standards and practices of the institution are eligible to participate in the programs. They must demonstrate financial need as determined by the institution using an approved need analysis system. They must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, must not be in default on a Title IV loan, and must meet citizen/resident requirements. The size of the award depends on the rate of pay and number of hours worked. The minimum-wage law applies.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1985, the Department of Education emphasized the following objective for the Work-Study Program:

o To promote greater use of job location and development centers, which provide support to institutional administrators in locating and developing part-time, off-campus employment for students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Approximately 440 institutions had established job location and development projects during the 1983-84 school year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1985, approximately $528 million in Federal Work-Study funds went to students. These funds, in conjunction with institutional matching funds, provided $614.9 million for 720,097 students. Funds to institutions were awarded as follows:

Public, 4-year	42%
Private, 4-year	37%
Public, 2-year	16%
Private, 2-year	2%
Proprietary	3%
	100%

Program data indicate that 3,471 postsecondary institutions participated in the Federal Work-Study Program during academic year 1984-85.

Almost 450 postsecondary institutions also participated in job location and development centers that assisted about 140,000 students. These centers provided about $240 million in total compensation to these students.

In fall 1984, a Higher Education Panel Survey found that 2,592 of 2,650 institutions of higher education--98 percent--received Work-Study funds from the Federal Government. More than 775 institutions--29 percent--received such funds from States; 235 of these institutions also received Work-Study funds from other sources. Of the 58 institutions not participating in the Federal Work-Study Program, 53 were private 2-year colleges (see E.1).

Student Participation: During academic year 1984-85, about 11 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the Work-Study Program (see Table 1). The corresponding participation rate in 1982-83 had been about 13 percent. Rates vary widely, however, by family income. In 1984-85, for example, participation rates were highest (19.5 percent) for persons in the lowest family income category (under $10,000) and lowest (3.4 percent) for those in the highest income group ($40,000+). This pattern has remained consistent for many years. Work-Study participants received an average of $760 during 1984-85.

The average amount of Work-Study award also appears to be strongly related to family income. In 1984-85, for example, participants with family incomes of $40,000+ received awards that were about $80 higher than the average for those with family incomes of less than $10,000 (see Table 1). The principal reason is that many students from higher-income families attend more expensive colleges and thus are eligible for larger amounts of aid. Many of these Work-Study awards amounted to a small percentage of the total cost.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM BY FAMILY INCOME ACADEMIC YEARS 1981-82 TO 1984-85

Academic Year		Family Income					
		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
1981-82	Average award	$684	$715	$743	$760	$786	$729
	% aided	20.7	18.4	14.2	9.3	3.9	12.7
	% of cost	16.6	15.8	15.2	14.5	14.4	15.5
1982-83	Average award	$685	$702	$738	$753	$782	$725
	% aided	21.9	19.3	14.7	10.2	4.6	12.8
	% of cost	14.6	14.6	15.0	14.8	13.5	14.1
1983-84	Average award	$720	$758	$764	$790	$809	$764
	% aided	25.2	22.1	16.6	11.8	5.4	14.4
	% of cost	14.3	14.7	14.4	14.3	12.8	13.3
1984-85	Average award	$752	$758	$747	$748	$831	$760
	% aided	19.5	17.0	13.5	8.4	3.4	10.7
	% of cost	13.2	12.5	11.4	9.8	10.2	11.7

KEY: Average award = Average dollars per recipient
% aided = number of recipients/total students
% of cost = (average award ÷ average cost)

Source: See E.3

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of Work-Study recipients by family income, sex, and race. Overall, the participation rate for women exceeds the rate for men by more than three percentage points, and the rate for blacks exceeds the rate for whites by almost seven percentage points. These differences vary, of course, by income categories.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME FALL 1984

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	17.7	14.5	11.9	7.1	3.2	9.0
Average per recipient	$790	$796	$772	$797	$850	$795
Women						
% participating	20.9	19.2	15.1	9.8	4.0	12.4
Average per recipient	$727	$734	$727	$713	$806	$734
Blacks						
participating	21.9	19.3	18.4	9.6	7.5	17.2
rage per recipient	$782	$811	$859	$848	$862	$815
Nonblacks						
% participating	18.8	16.7	13.1	8.4	3.4	10.6
Average per recipient	$741	$749	$735	$742	$829	$751

Source: See E.3

Program Effectiveness: Program effectiveness is measured partly by the scope of work opportunities provided. As already mentioned, a recent Higher Education Panel Study found that 98 percent of 2,650 institutions of higher education with a Work-Study program also received Federal funds. The Work-Study funds accounted for more than three-quarters of all funds in 47 percent of the schools and for between one-quarter and three-quarters in 45 percent of the other schools. Although additional funds were available from State and institutional sources, neither of these sources was as important as the Federal program for creating work situations (see E.3).

Student aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of total cost during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. In academic year 1984-85, for example, the average award met 11.7 percent of total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen. In 1981-82, the average award met 15.5 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the percentage of total cost shows minor variation across family income categories. For example, an average award met 13.2 percent of total cost for students with family incomes of less than $10,000 and 10.2 percent for those in the $40,000+ group. However, the percentage of costs covered by work earnings fell from 15.5 to 11.7 over the same period, reflecting the increased growth in college costs over and above increases in real income.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Work-Study Program is considered an essential component of the Administration's package of student financial aid. In addition to providing work opportunities for students, the program encourages use of funds to support programs for adult literacy and employment at eligible day-care centers. The program also strengthens the relationship between academic programs and Work-Study experiences through the Cooperative Education Program (CFDA No. 84.055).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Student Financial Aid for Full-Time Undergraduates," HEP Survey No. 68, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1986.

2. "The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)," University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1985.

3. "Student Financial Aid, Fall 1984," HEP Survey No. 68, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1985-86 academic year will be available in the spring of 1986.

The Department is also planning a National Study of Student Financial Aid for the fall of 1986. It will survey students, parents, and institutions for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Daniel Morrissey, (202) 245-8281

UPWARD BOUND
(CFDA No. 84.047)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417C, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1a) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/	Allocation 1/
1981	$200,000,000	$156,500,000	$66,501,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000	63,720,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	68,366,514
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	70,754,376
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	73,614,193

Purpose: To generate among low-income youths and potential first-generation college students the skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school. The goal of the program is to increase the academic performance and motivation of eligible enrollees so that they may complete secondary school and successfully pursue postsecondary education programs.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for the Upward Bound Program were as follows:

- To provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new Upward Bound grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and developing and disseminating an application development guide;
- To provide current grantees with continuation funding application materials and to issue 421 noncompeting continuation Upward Bound grant awards;
- To respond to recommendations of the General Accounting Office (GAO) on assessing Upward Bound projects' success in meeting two important program goals: (1) increasing participants' academic skills and (2) enabling participants to be successful in postsecondary education; and
- To establish grant-monitoring procedures to allow the Department to assess changes in project performance over time, to consider requests for grants, and to assess overall program accomplishments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Five application preparation workshops were held for prospective Upward Bound applicants, and an application development guide was prepared and sent to all persons who requested a program grant application form.
- The Department received applications for 421 noncompeting continuation grants, processed them, and issued grant awards for program year 1985-86.
- In response to the recommendations of the General Accounting Office, the Department ensured that every Upward Bound application funded in FY 1985 contained objectives for measuring the academic skills growth of Upward Bound participants and for following up on Upward Bound graduates to determine their postsecondary success.
- The Department implemented a variety of cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures, including extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and onsite cross-program monitoring.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The Department of Education makes grants to participating institutions and agencies to provide educational services to disadvantaged youths. Student benefits typically begin with a 6- to 8-week residency and study on a college or secondary school campus. During the academic year, the students may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During the junior and senior years, the students explore postsecondary options.

Program Scope: In FY 1985, 421 noncompeting continuation awards were made for a total amount of $73,614,193. About 32,500 participants were served at an average Federal cost of $2,265 per participant (See Table 1).

Table 1

PROJECT FUNDS, NEW AND CONTINUING
FY 1983 TO FY 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
New Projects	423	—	—
Continuation	—	422	421
Average Award	$161,440	$167,664	$174,856
Persons Served	32,606	32,600	32,500
Average Fed. Cost Per Participant	$2,094	$2,170	$2,265
Budget Authority	$68,289,000	$70,754,376	$73,614,193

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see the FY 1984 AER for latest information).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration proposed to reduce funding for Upward Bound in FY 1986. All Upward Bound grantees were to be required to share 20 percent of the costs of their projects. Participant eligibility would include low-income and handicapped persons, and the requirement that participants be first-generation college students would be deleted. The Congress did not enact the Administration's proposal.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program reports and files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (until FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs, but are allocated administratively.

TALENT SEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.044)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417B, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[1]	Allocation[1]
1981	$200,000,000	$156,500,000	$17,113,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000	17,057,594
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	17,057,594
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	17,628,233
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	20,728,468

Purpose: To identify qualified youths with potential for postsecondary education; to encourage them to complete secondary school and to enroll in postsecondary education programs; to publicize the availability of student financial aid; and to increase the number of secondary and postsecondary school dropouts who reenter an educational program.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's objectives for the Talent Search Program included the following:

- To establish grant-monitoring procedures that will improve the Department's ability to assess individual projects and thus enable Department personnel to make better decisions about requests for grant renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments;
- To provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new Talent Search grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and by developing and disseminating an application development guide; and
- To develop and have approved a new performance-reporting form for the Talent Search Program.
- Grantees must pursue four goals:

1. To enhance participants' motivation to complete secondary school
2. To increase the application rates to postsecondary institutions
3. To increase participants' knowledge of educational opportunities and of the availability of financial aid, and
4. To increase the number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department implemented cost-effective monitoring procedures, including extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and onsite cross-program monitoring.
- Five application preparation workshops were conducted, and an application development guide was prepared and sent to all persons who requested a program grant application form.
- The proposed new performance-reporting form was not approved by OMB and a revised form is being developed.
- The new project-monitoring procedures were used to assess accomplishment of the four goals established for the grantees.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, the Department made 177 new awards for a total of $20,728,468. The projects provided services to an estimated 195,968 participants at an average cost per participant of $106 (See Table 1).

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW AND CONTINUING AWARDS
FY 1983 TO FY 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
New Projects	---	---	177
Continuations	167	167	---
Average Award	$102,108	$105,558	$117,110
Persons Served	190,825	190,800	195,968
Average Fed. cost Per Participant	$89	$92	$106
Budget Authority	$17,052,000	$17,628,233	$20,728,468

Source: See E.1

Further, in FY 1982, the latest year for which data are available, student participants were distributed as follows: about 41 percent were black, 32 percent white, 20 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent other ethnic groups. Also about 56 percent were women, and 44 percent were men.

Program Effectiveness: The Washington, D.C., Office of the College Entrance Examination Board recently completed a study of the Talent Search and Educational Opportunity Center programs. The researchers collected written survey and telephone interview data from 11 Talent Search projects spread across the country, as well as examining annual performance and other data on the programs collected by the Department of Education.

Despite some local successes, the researchers concluded that it is difficult to evaluate the overall success of these programs because it is impossible to measure aggregate program performance across the surveyed projects. Projects collect and report enrollment and other data in different ways, producing placement data that are not comparable. Fundamental data on actual placements of project clients in postsecondary education are not available from the Department of Education's performance-reporting system.

Other deficiencies in the Department's performance-reporting system were found:

- The system does not differentiate "college-ready" youths from those who are not yet of college age--the group that the developmental service strategy targets.
- No common method governs the way that clients report data.

The study made the following recommendations to the Department:

- Develop uniform procedures for granting individual projects a waiver for serving youths (Educational Opportunity Centers) and adults (Talent Search).
- In funding existing projects, recognize the effects of inflation on static grant size.
- Recognize the larger per client costs of rural projects when allocating funds, because clients are widely dispersed in extraordinarily large service areas.
- If sufficient funds do become available to support additional projects, priority should go to projects that propose to serve significant numbers of Hispanic clients, because they are relatively underrepresented in the programs.
- Overhaul the performance-reporting systems for these programs.

D. Highlights of Activities

In order to focus limited funding on the highest priority and effective direct services programs of Upward Bound and Special Services, no funds were requested for the Talent Search Program for FY 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.
2. Helping Disadvantaged Youth and Adults Enter College: An Assessment of Two Federal Programs, Paul L. Franklin, The College Entrance Examination Board, Washington, D.C., 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program data is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (until 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY CENTERS
(CFDA No. 84.066)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417E, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1c) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]/	Appropriation[1]/	Allocation[1]/
1981	$200,000,000	$156,500,000	$8,000,674
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000	7,800,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	7,800,000
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	8,101,898
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	9,209,468

Purpose: To provide information on financial and academic assistance available to qualified adults who want postsecondary education, and to help these people apply for admission to postsecondary educational institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's objectives for Educational Opportunity Centers (EOCs) included the following:

- To establish grant-monitoring procedures that will enable the Department to better assess individual projects and thus make better decisions about requests for grant renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments.
- To provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new EOC grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and developing and disseminating an application development guide.
- To review existing EOC regulations and policies to determine whether the Department should pursue changes such as developing a new performance-reporting form.
- Grantees must pursue five goals:
  1. To enhance participants' motivation to complete secondary education,
  2. To increase application rates to postsecondary institutions,
  3. To increase participants' knowledge of educational opportunities and of the availability of financial aid,

4. To increase the number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance.

5. To enhance participants' motivation to complete studies in a postsecondary institution.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department implemented cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures, including extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and onsite cross-program monitoring.

- Five application preparation workshops were conducted, and an application development guide was prepared and sent to all persons who requested a program grant application form.

- A new annual performance report form for use by the EOC Program grantees was developed and submitted to OMB for approval.

- The new project-monitoring procedures were used to assess accomplishment of the five goals established for the grantees.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, the Department made 37 new program awards for a total of $9,209,468. The projects provided services to an estimated 106,250 participants at an average cost per participant of $87 (See Table 1).

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS
FY 1983 TO FY 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
New Projects	---	---	37
Continuation	33	33	---
Average Award	$236,364	$245,512	$248,905
Persons Served	104,300	104,300	106,250
Average Fed. Cost Per Participant	$75	$78	$87
Budget Authority	$7,800,000	$8,101,898	$9,209,468

Source: See E.1

Types of Benefits Provided: The EOCs identify persons who need the program's services, counsel them about opportunitities for furthering their education, and help them apply for admission and financial aid. The centers also provide remedial and tutorial services to students enrolled or accepted for enrollment in postsecondary schools.

Program Effectiveness: The Washington, D.C., Office of the College Entrance Examination Board recently completed a study of the Talent Search (TS) and EOC programs. The study collected written survey and telephone interview data from 11 TS projects and 6 EOCs spread across the country, as well as examining annual performance and other data on the programs collected by the Department of Education.

Despite some local successes, the researchers concluded that evaluating the overall success of these programs is difficult because measuring aggregate program performance across the surveyed projects is impossible. Projects collect and report enrollment and other data in different ways, producing placement data that are not comparable. The fundamental data on actual placement of project clients in postsecondary education are not available because the Department of Education's performance reporting system is inconsistent.

Other deficiencies in the Department's performance reporting system were found:

- For EOCs there is no standard definition of client for recordkeeping and reporting.
- There is no way to distinguish between EOC clients who are "college-ready" and those who are unprepared to enter college because of work, family responsibilities, or inadequate academic background.
- No common methodology governs the way projects report data.

The study made the following recommendations to the Department:

- Develop uniform procedures for granting individual projects a waiver for serving youth (EOCs) and adults (TS).
- In funding existing projects, recognize the effects of inflation on static grant size.
- When allocating funds, recognize the larger per client costs of rural projects because clients are widely dispersed in extraordinarily large service areas.
- If sufficient funds do become available to support additional projects, priority should go to projects that propose to serve significant numbers of Hispanic clients, because they are relatively underrepresented in the programs.
- Overhaul the performance-reporting systems for these programs.

D. Highlights of Activities

No funds were requested for the program for FY 1986 in order to focus limited funding on the highest priority and effective direct services programs of Upward Bound and Special Services.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

2. Helping Disadvantaged Youth and Adults Enter College: An Assessment of Two Federal Programs, Paul L. Franklin, The College Entrance Examination Board, Washington, D.C., 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (until FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS
(CFDA No. 84.042)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 417A and 417D, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1b) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1/]	Appropriation[1/]	Allocation[1/]
1981	$200,000,000	$156,500,000	$63,885,326
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000	60,702,406
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	60,555,892
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	67,294,974
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	70,083,664

Purpose: To identify low-income, first-generation, or physically handicapped college students who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment by participating postsecondary institutions and to provide them with necessary support services to pursue programs of postsecondary education successfully.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students (SSDS) Program were as follows:

- o To issue continuation grant awards to approximately 663 SSDS projects;
- o To carry out a variety of cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures to allow the Department to assess individual project performance over time, to consider requests for continuation awards, and to assess overall program accomplishments;
- o To notify project directors about program training opportunities and reporting requirements and to disseminate findings from the Inspector General's audit report; and
- o To develop and obtain approval for a new performance report form for the SSDS program grantees.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department of Education issued a total of 663 continuation grant awards during FY 1985.
- A variety of cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, review of annual performance reports and other data, and onsite monitoring by headquarters program staff and regional grant representatives.
- The Department sent all project directors information on SSDS Program competition, training opportunities for SSDS staff, reporting requirements, requirements on maintenance of satisfactory progress by project participants, and the recent Inspector General's audit report, "Results of OIG's Limited Review of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students." Directors were strongly encouraged to improve their documentation of project services.
- A new performance report form, which should improve the quality of annual data collected on the SSDS Program, was developed and submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for clearance. The form was approved by OMB in October 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, the Department made 663 continuation awards for a total of $70,083,664. Projects are expected to serve 154,000 participants at an average Federal cost per participant of $455 (See Table 1).

Table 1

PROJECT AWARDS, NEW AND CONTINUING,
FY 1983 TO FY 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
New Projects	—	664	—
Continuation	639	—	663
Average Award	$94,767	$101,348	$105,707
Persons Served	150,293	154,400	154,000
Average Fed. Cost Per Participant	$403	$436	$455
Budget Authority	$60,556,000	$67,294,974	$70,083,664

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: According to the recent Inspector General's audit report, "Results of OIG's Limited Review of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students," the administration of these programs, specifically the Special Services to Disadvantaged Students program, at the institutional level could be improved. Significant problems existed in the documentation of student eligibility and of services provided to students. In some institutions, there was duplication of services between these programs and State-funded programs." (E.2).

In four of the five programs that were audited, records were found to be inadequate for proper program implementation. In one project, files lacked documentation that any services were provided; they did not prove that services addressed the student's needs; and they indicated that some students were not even eligible for project services. The Inspector General's Office concluded that file work was neglected and, as a result, disregarded as a source of information. "Overall, record-keeping was not stressed by the institution reviewed, and they seemed to rely on the counselors' knowledge of the student's background, needs, and progress."

The audit report further stated: "Student files are, in our opinion, the single reference which (1) provides counselors and instructors with a comprehensive view of student background, academic weaknesses, performance and academic progress; (2) provides program management with the means to assess progress in accomplishing objectives; and (3) supports compliance with program requirements." (E.2).

D. Highlights of Activities

The new performance report has been disseminated for the collection of impact data on the SSDS Program. Once collected and analyzed, these data will be used as an aid to program management.

Efforts will be made to increase onsite monitoring of projects and to provide more technical assistance in order to improve project administration. The number of training opportunities for SSDS project staff is expected to increase.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.
2. Office of the Inspector General, "Results of OIG's Limited Review of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students," U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers, (until FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs, but are allocated administratively.

VETERANS' COST-OF-INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.064)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 420; as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070e-1) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$6,019,000
1982	$12,000,000	4,800,000
1983	12,000,000	3,000,000
1984	12,000,000	3,000,000
1985	Indefinite	3,000,000

Purpose: To encourage colleges and universities to serve the special education needs of veterans, especially Vietnam-era and disadvantaged veterans.

Applicants must demonstrate and document either a 10 percent increase in undergraduate veteran enrollment in the year of application over the preceding academic year, or a veteran enrollment constituting at least 10 percent of total enrollment. Only veterans who (1) are enrolled at least half-time and (2) are receiving benefits under Chapters 31 and 34 of Title 38, U.S.C., can be considered in the enrollment count.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To complete processing of all required reports (budgets, financial status, and program performance reports) and make awards, and
- To visit at least one-third of the institutions funded and provide technical assistance as needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department of Education processed all documents, including applications for academic year 1985-86 funds, and awarded grants to 601 institutions of higher education.
- Program staff participated in cross-program monitoring activities and conducted site visits as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction (VCIP) program was created in FY 1972. The peak year of veteran enrollment in postsecondary education was FY 1976, when there were approximately 910,000 enrolled veterans eligible for services. By 1981, the number of eligible veterans had declined to 212,000, and in the years 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985 they leveled off at approximately 200,000. Eligible enrollment is projected to fall below 200,000 in 1986.

Types of Benefits Provided: Institutions receiving VCIP funds must maintain a full-time Office of Veterans' Affairs and provide outreach and recruitment programs, counseling and tutorial services, and special education programs for veterans, with special emphasis on services for physically disabled, incarcerated, and educationally disadvantaged veterans.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Because of the sharply declining number of enrolled Vietnam-era veterans and the capacity of existing institution-wide programs to provide adequate, appropriate services to this smaller number of veterans, the Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William J. Craven, Jr. (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Robert H. Baris, (202) 245-8281

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION (FIPSE)
(CFDA No. 84.116)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title X, as amended by P.L. 98-374 (20 U.S.C. 1135 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$20,000,000	$13,500,000
1982	13,500,000	11,520,000
1983	13,500,000	11,710,000
1984	13,500,000	11,710,000
1985	50,000,000	12,710,000

Purposes: To provide grants to support innovative projects designed to improve the access to and the quality of postsecondary education for these general purposes:

- Encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and providing educational opportunity for all;
- Creating institutions and programs that offer new paths to career and professional training and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
- Establishing institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
- Carrying out changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes in postsecondary educational institutions;
- Designing and introducing cost-effective methods of instruction and operation;
- Introducing institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
- Introducing reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties; and
- Creating new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and introducing reforms in current institutional practices related to credentials.

There are three programs under which these goals are implemented. They are:

Comprehensive Program - More than 95 percent of FIPSE's funds support the variety of action-oriented improvement projects included in the Comprehensive Program. Projects span the full range of postsecondary issues, including improvement in the quality of undergraduate and professional education, integration of education and work, applications of technology to learning, initiation of partnerships between schools and businesses, and delivery of appropriate educational services to a variety of learners.

Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program - These grants enable educators to analyze important practices in postsecondary education and to make such advances know and available to a broad audience.

Final-Year Dissemination Program - This program supports a small number of dissemination grants for selected FIPSE projects in their final year so that the impact of funded project activities can be spread to other institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for the Comprehensive Program was to stress the importance of teacher education and college-school collaborations, applications of technology to education, and reforms in graduate and professional education.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Table 1 shows six current issue areas that have been growing in size in recent years and now form a major part of the FIPSE portfolio of grants and completed projects. These themes are singled out for illustration. They do not include all issues or problems addressed by FIPSE projects.

Table 1

NEW GRANTS, BY CATEGORY OF CURRENT ISSUES, FY 1985

Current Issues	New Grants in FY 1985
Access to Higher Education	13
Science and Technology	15
Teacher Education/School-College Collaboration	12
Improvements in Undergraduate Education	15
Economic Growth	5
Reform in Graduate and Professional Education	11
Total	71

Source: See E.1

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF FIPSE AWARDS BY PROGRAM AREA, FY 1985

	New Awards			Non-competitive Continuation Grants		
Program Area	Number	Total Amount	Average Amount	Number	Total Amount	Average Amount
Comprehensive	60	$4,665,467	$77,758	102	$7,923,829	$77,685
Mina Shaughnessy Scholars (supplements)	11	42,704	3,882			
Final Year Dissemination	10	78,000	7,800			
All Programs Total	81	4,786,171	NA	102	7,923,829	77,685

Source: See E.1

Seventy-five percent of the FIPSE grants went to individual institutions of higher education, while the remainder went to consortia of institutions, State agencies, professional associations and other types of organizations involved in learning beyond K-12 schooling (See Table 3).

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS, FY 1984 - FY 1985

	1984	1985
Total Number of Applications received:	2,784	2,260
Number of Grants by Institutional Type and Control:		
2-year public	19	19
2-year private	1	3
4-year public	72	71
4-year private	41	38
Other (including public and private organizations)	65	40
(Historically black colleges)	(5)	(10)
Total	198	171
Federal Funds to:		
2-year public	$ 1,565,735	$ 1,539,780
2-year private	73,000	226,418
4-year public	4,660,892	5,232,295
4-year private	2,438,041	2,444,778
Other	2,868,898	3,266,606
(Historically black colleges)	(301,261)	(553,867)
Total Appropriation	$11,606,566	$12,709,877

Source: See E.1

Special Program Initiatives: FIPSE has implemented several new dissemination and management efforts.

More than 50 past and current grantees that use the computer to improve postsecondary education have agreed to reflect on their experiences and inform educators nationally about the opportunities they have found, the products they have produced, and the problems they have not been able to solve. Each participant is taking responsibility for reporting to a particular constituency on behalf of the whole group. The participants periodically meet face-to-face and regularly communicate via computer teleconference.

Nearly 20 FIPSE projects, called the Education and Economy Alliance, are linked together to address problems resulting from local economic and demographic changes. The projects, which tend to serve adults, involve collaborations between colleges, business and industry, local governments, and community organizations. FIPSE periodically convenes project directors to discuss and analyze trends and responses and to increase dissemination of information. Several issue papers and case studies are being prepared in academic year 1985-86 by one of the project grantees to aid other institutions and States that may wish to conduct similar programs.

Increasing numbers of FIPSE proposals and grants are focused on the improvement of teacher education. In partnership with major foundations, FIPSE has sponsored dialogues on issues of participants in content, standards, and improvement in teacher education. In 1985-86, 20 to 30 teacher education projects will convene in small thematic groups to analyze ways to upgrade undergraduate and professional preparation.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

FIPSE received an additional $1 million in its FY 1985 appropriation to stimulate improvements in teacher education. In response, FIPSE highlighted problems, organized national meetings with foundations, and made awards exceeding $1 million to address issues of teacher preparation.

FIPSE continues to analyze project characteristics and the contexts in which they operate as the basis for improved assistance to grantees. Through new monitoring practices--computer conferencing and clusters of projects that collaborate--FIPSE assists operational projects, and extends knowledge about postsecondary developments.

FIPSE staff members have analyzed the monitoring of FIPSE projects; research was completed in FY 1985 and is being used to improve program monitoring. The Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program underwent internal review in FY 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rusty Garth or Lynn DeMeester, (202) 245-8091

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS
STAFF AND LEADERSHIP PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.103)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1d) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/	Allocation 1/
1981	$200,000,000	$156,500,000	$1,000,000
1982	165,000,000 2/	150,240,000	960,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	960,000
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	960,000
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	1,302,975

Purpose: To provide training for local project leaders and staff employed in, or preparing for employment in, Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, or Educational Opportunity Centers programs. The training is designed to improve the participants' skills in leadership, management, academic instruction, and counseling.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To publish funding priorities for the Training Program based on the Secretarial Goals for 1985.
- To consult with persons in regional and State professional associations with special knowledge of training needs of the Special Programs, and
- To establish procedures for evaluating the experience of previously funded Training Program applicants.
- To issue 11 new Training Program grants.
- To establish grant-monitoring procedures to allow the Department to assess individual project performance, to consider requests for new awards, and to assess overall Training Program accomplishments.
- To review Training Program regulations and policies to determine whether changes are needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- To implement the Secretarial Goals for 1985, the Application Notice of the Training Program contained a section titled "Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year 1985." This section detailed four Secretarial priorities for FY 1985 Training Program grants. Applicants addressing any of these priorities were given extra credit during the evaluation process.
- Public comments on the training needs of Special Programs staff and leadership personnel were solicited at an open meeting held in Washington, D.C., and through the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the Funding Priorities for FY 1985, published in the Federal Register.
- The Department developed procedures and standards for assessing the experience of previously funded Training Program applicants and used the information obtained to assign credit for prior experience to 23 eligible applicants.
- The Department received and processed 41 eligible grant applications and awarded 15 grants for FY 1985.
- The Department implemented a variety of monitoring procedures, including extensive telephone monitoring, review of reports and other data, and four onsite visits.
- The Training Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final form in 1982. As a result of recent grant competitions, the Department is considering revising the selection criteria in the regulations to better evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a proposed training program.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1985, $1,302,975 was awarded to institutions and non-profit organizations. This amount funded 15 grants. Funding at this level will finance 1,496 participants at an average cost of $871 per person.

The Training Program supports short-term training institutes, workshops and inservice training programs to improve the skills of staff and leaders. More than 4000 staff persons have participated in the program over a three year period (See Table 1).

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS
FY 1983 TO FY 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
Projects	12	10	15
Average Award	$80,000	$96,000	$86,865
Participants (est.)	1,500	1,019	1,496
Average Fed. cost per participant	$640	$942	$871
Budget Authority	$960,000	$960,000	$1,302,975

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 AER for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Efforts were made to increase onsite monitoring of projects and to provide more technical assistance in order to improve project administration. Another effort was to increase the number of training opportunities for Special Programs project staff.

All project directors were informed of available training opportunities.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol J. Smith, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (until FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively.

2. Beginning in FY 1982, the Training Program became a discretionary grant program instead of a contract program.

INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.031)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III, P.L. 89-329, as amended by P.L. 96-374, P.L. 98-95, P.L. 98-312 (Section 1), P.L. 98-139, and P.L. 98-619 (U.S.C. 1051-1069C) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$120,000,000	$120,000,000
1982	129,600,000 1/	134,416,000 2/
1983	129,600,000 1/	134,416,000 3/
1984	129,600,000 1/	134,416,000
1985	270,000,000	141,208,000

Purpose: To help institutions of higher education that have limited financial resources and that serve significant percentages of low-income students to improve their academic programs, institutional management, fiscal stability, and student services; the ultimate objective is institutional self-sufficiency.

Eligibility: "Eligible institutions" are defined in the legislation as institutions of higher education that (1) provide an educational program that awards a B.A. degree (4-year institutions) or an A.A. degree (junior or community colleges); (2) are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or are making reasonable progress toward such accreditation; (3) have satisfied both of the foregoing requirements during the 5 academic years preceding the academic year during which program assistance would be provided—with the exception that the 5-year stipulation may be waived by the Secretary for institutions that provide services that will increase the higher education opportunities available to American Indian, Spanish-speaking, rural, black, or low-income students; (4) enroll a relatively high percentage of low-income students receiving Federal student financial assistance; and (5) have lower education and general expenditures than do similar institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal goals were as follows:

o To maintain the Department's commitment to historically black colleges.

o To provide technical assistance to and review of ongoing projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department increased funding to historically black colleges by more than $5 million in FY 1985 over FY 1984.
- Program staff visits to institutions were limited to those in greatest need of technical assistance.
- Programs were funded in accordance with the Department's management goals.

C. Cost and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The Title III program was originally established to help historically black colleges and other institutions that needed assistance in improving their management and educational program.

The Administration looks to this program as an important funding source for historically black colleges. The Institutional Aid Program consists of four parts as described in the next paragraphs:

The Strengthening Institutions Program (Part A) provides 1-to-3-year renewable grants and 4-to-7-year, nonrenewable grants. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this program must be used for nonrenewable grants. At least 24 percent of the funds must be awarded to 2-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development, special services, management improvement activities, purchase of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and shared use of facilities.

The Institutions with Special Needs Program (Part B) provides nonrenewable, 1-to-5-year grants. Under this program, historically black colleges and universities must receive at least 50 percent of the funds which they received under Title III in FY 1979, or $27,035,000. At least 30 percent of the funds under this program must be awarded to 2-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development, special services or management improvement activities, purchase of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and shared use of facilities.

The Challenge Grant Program (Part C) is no longer authorized to make new awards. Multiyear awards made prior to FY 1983 will continue until termination.

The Endowment Grant Program (Part C) provides eligible institutions with a Federal grant that matchs institutionally raised endowment funds. The minimum award is $50,000, and the maximum award, $500,000. Institutions are eligible to receive two grants within a 5-year cycle. The cycle begins the first year that an institution receives an award. An institution must, however, establish eligibility for program participation each year it applies for funds. There are no restrictions on the use of the income produced by the endowment except that an institution may not spend more than 50 percent of the annual income produced during the 20-year period beginning with the initial grant. The endowment corpus may not be spent for the 20-year grant period.

__Program Scope__: Table 1 shows the obligations by program part for FY 1984 and 1985. In FY 1985, greater emphasis was placed on funding planning and renewable 1-to-3-year grants under the Strengthening Program (Part A) and the Endowment Grant Program (Part C). Between FY 1983 and 1984, the funding of historically black institutions increased, in line with the Administration's goal of increasing Federal funding to black colleges (see Table 2). In addition, colleges serving large numbers of American Indians, Asians or Pacific Islanders, and Hispanic students received increased funding in FY 1985.

Table 1

OBLIGATIONS BY PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1984 and 1985*

Descriptive Measures	Number of Awards		Number of New Awards		Average Award		Federal Cost	
	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985
Part A: Strengthening Program								
Planning Grants	7	18	—	—	$ 23,000	$ 24,000	$ 159,000	$ 420,000
-to-3-Year Grants	116	98	19	116	139,000	170,000	16,288,000	16,754,000
4-to-7-Year Grants	154	195	—	0	298,000	276,000	45,980,000	47,900,000
Part B: Special Needs								
1-to-5-Year Grants	177	163	0	30	324,000	327,000	57,175,000	53,604,000
Part C: Challenge Grants	45	22	0	0	170,000	266,000	7,679,000	6,400,000
Part C: Endowment Grants	35	52	35	52	210,000	292,000	7,135,000	16,200,000
Program Totals	509	498	55	163	$264,000	$284,000	$134,416,000	$141,208,000

*Estimates only.

Source: See E.1

Table 2

INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAM OBLIGATIONS BY INSTITUTIONAL ETHNICITY, LEVEL OF OFFERING AND CONTROL, FISCAL YEARS 1984 and 1985

Race/ Ethnicity	1984 Number	1984 Obligations	% of Total Dollars	1985 Number	1985 Obligations	% of Total Dollars
Historically Black	96	$39,746,000	30%	125	$ 46,183,000	33%
Predominately Black	26	6,209,000	5	26	5,420,000	4
White	348	79,672,000	58	349	76,804,000	55
American Indian	10	2,320,000	2	10	2,402,000	2
Asians/Pacific Islanders	4	848,000	1	9	1,989,000	1
Hispanic	25	5,189,000	4	28	6,477,000	5
Total	509	$133,984,000	100%	547	$139,275,000*	100%
Level of Offering and Control						
4-Year Private	175	$ 49,548,000	28%	171	$ 49,567,000	28%
4-Year Public	98	31,195,000	31	106	33,838,000	31
2-Year Private	32	6,490,000	20	33	7,599,000	20
2-Year Public	204	43,520,000	21	237	49,000,000	21
Total	509	$130,753,000	100%	547	$140,004,000*	100%

1/ These totals do not match exactly because race/ethnicity distributions were estimated.

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: No new information was available in FY 1985. However, in October 1983, the Department completed a study of the Institutional Aid Program and a workbook for program managers. That study is cited in E.2. (See FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for details.)

D. Highlights of Activities

The FY 1985 funding level was $141,208,000. The appropriation was to ensure funding for historically black colleges at a level of not less than $45,741,000 under all Title III programs, not simply for Part B, as is stated in the authorizing legislation.

The Challenge Grant Program is being phased out, but multiyear awards made prior to 1983 will continue until their termination date.

The Department has proposed to consolidate the current four-program configuration into two programs and to simplify the eligibility rules. Part A and Part B programs would be merged, the Endowment Grant Program (Part C) would be maintained, and the Challenge Grant Program (Part C) would continue to phase out.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, FY 1985, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.
2. Junius Davis, Roderick Ironside, Jerry Van Sant, *Factors Associated with Successful Developmental Investment in Title III Eligible Institutions: A Special Report to Program Managers in the U.S. Department of Education*, by Research Triangle Institute, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1983.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Joan DeSantis, (202) 245-9091

Program Studies : Salvatore Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 established the authorization level for FY 1982 through FY 1984 at $129,600,000; however, the appropriation bills for each of these years effectively raised these authorization levels to the higher amounts.
2. Includes a $10 million supplemental appropriation.
3. Includes a $4,816,000 supplemental appropriation in the FY 1983 supplemental appropriation bill.

MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.120)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Section 3(a)(1), 81-507, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862); Department of Education Organization Act, Section 304 (20 U.S.C. 3444); Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, Sections 515(d) and 528 (3) as extended by General Educational Provisions Act, Section 414 (20 U.S.C. 1226a) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
1982	5,000,000	4,800,000
1983	5,000,000	4,800,000
1984	5,000,000	4,800,000
1985	5,000,000	5,000,000

Purpose: To help minority institutions improve the quality of their science education programs and better prepare their students for graduate work or careers in science; to improve the access of undergraduate minority students to careers in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering; to improve access for precollege minority students to careers in science and engineering through community outreach programs conducted through eligible minority colleges and universities; and to improve the capability of minority institutions for self-assessment, management, and evaluation of their science programs and dissemination of their results.

Eligibility: Private and public, accredited, 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education are eligible if their enrollments are predominantly (50 percent or more) American Indian; Alaskan native; black, not of Hispanic origin; Hispanic; Pacific Islander; or any combination of these or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science and engineering. Proposals may also be submitted by nonprofit science-oriented organizations, professional scientific societies, and all nonprofit accredited colleges and universities that will render a needed service to a group of institutions for the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP) or provide inservice training for project directors, scientists, or engineers from eligible minority institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To maintain the Department's commitment to providing financial assistance to minority institutions,

- To provide participants with technical assistance and conduct audit reviews, and
- To complete processing of grant applications within 6 months of closing notice.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department's commitment to program was maintained for FY 1985.
- Technical assistance in FY 1985 was limited.
- The Department processed all grants within the target period.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Almost 60 percent of the funds were expended for institutional grants. In FY 1984, no proposal was rated high enough to be funded in the Cooperative and Design categories, but four proposals were funded in FY 1985. Total awards rose from 34 in FY 1984 to 38 in FY 1985.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER THE
MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FISCAL YEARS 1983, 1984, AND 1985

Type of Award	Max. Size and Duration	1983		1984		1985	
		Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number
Institutional	$300,000 (3 yr)	$2,946,000	14	$3,703,396	16	$2,939,897	14
Cooperative	$300,000 (3 yr)	$527,232	2	0	0	$987,009	3
Design	$20,000 (1 yr)	$55,210	3	0	0	$18,828	1
Special	$150,000 (2 yr)	$1,130,000	20	$1,086,604	18	$1,072,240	20
Total		$4,658,442	39	$,790,000	34	$5,017,974	38

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: Staff analysis of the interim and final grants reveals that more than 75 percent of the grant-initiated activities have been institutionalized. In some cases, institutional records were sufficient to assess the program, but the program should be better documented by the institution so that the performance of this program can be assessed. (See FY 1983 AER for last formal stydy.)

Table 2 indicates that 180 out of 260 eligible institutions (approximately 69 percent) participated in the program through FY 1985.

Table 2

MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION, FY 1972-1985

Predominant Minority Group	Number Eligible*	Number of Awards**	Number of Institutions Receiving Awards***
Alaskan Native	4	2	1
American Indian	25	31	21
Black	158	234	113
Mexican American	16	20	10
Puerto Rican	25	42	19
Micronesian	2	3	1
Combination/Other	30	41	15
Total	260	373	180

* Does not include 34 institutions which are not accredited or whose eligibility/accreditation is uncertain.

** Some institutions have received more than one award.

***Includes nine nonaccredited American Indian institutions and one Hawaiian institution not included in the current eligibility count.

Source: See E.1

D. Highlights of Activities

Program priorities will continue to focus on improving the quality of instruction in mathematics and science at minority institutions and on improving access for minority students to careers in science and engineering.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Program files, 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Program staff will summarize reports to be filed by institutions for FY 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Argelia Velez Rodriguez, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.097)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part E, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1134n-1134p) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$ 5,000,000	$3,000,000
1982	1,000,000	960,000
1983	1,000,000	605,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	10,000,000	1,500,000

Purpose: To establish or expand programs in accredited law schools to provide clinical experience to law students.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the major program objectives were to continue funding successful projects and to fund new projects that met the funding criteria.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985, 44 applicants were awarded a total of $1.5 million.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits Provided: The Law School Clinical Experience program supports expanded supervision of students engaged in clinical experience while allowing institutions to develop and expand their clinical curriculums. During academic year 1984-85, about 1,500 law students benefited from a supervised clinical experience supported by the 44 project grants.

Program Scope: For academic year 1984-85, $1 million was awarded from FY 1984 funds to support clinical legal education programs at 44 law schools. Academic year 1985-86 grant award amounts will be higher as the appropriation was raised to $1.5 million.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Most of the nation's accredited law schools now have programs of clinical experience. For example, the Ford Foundation-sponsored Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility has spent about $7 million over the past 10 years to support about 100 clinical legal education programs. Law schools are now including such clinics in their regular budgets. Consequently, the Administration sees no justification for continued Federal funding of this program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEGAL TRAINING FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(CFDA No. 84.136)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part D; as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 11341-1134m) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$ 5,000,000	$1,000,000
1982	1,000,000	960,000
1983	1,000,000	1,000,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	10,000,000	1,500,000

Purpose: To help persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training in the legal profession.

Eligibility: Public and private agencies and organizations other than institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for grants or contracts under this program. A noncompetitive project grant is awarded annually to the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO) to administer the program.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To redress the substantial underrepresentation of minority and economically disadvantaged groups within the legal profession;
- To serve persons who aspire and are qualified to enter the legal profession but who, because of substantial economic deficiency and marginal admissions credentials, may be unable to gain admission to law school under prevailing standards; and
- To provide these students with the opportunity for law school matriculation through the operation of summer institutes and the provision of annual fellowships.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Support through this program has enabled the CLEO, in concert with participating law schools, to achieve the following:

- Prospective law students who are members of minority or economically disadvantaged groups and who are in need of services provided by the program have been identified.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Seven regional institutes across the country have been conducted to provide intensive prelaw training to students in the summer prior to their entrance into law school; each student has been evaluated at the end of the institute, in terms of the student's potential for successfully mastering the law school curriculum; and law school placement assistance has been provided for all successful students.

- Annual stipends of $1,000 have been provided to all students who have successfully completed the summer institutes and are enrolled in a law school accredited by the American Bar Association.

C. Costs and Benefits

Institutes: During academic year 1984-85, more than 200 potential first-year law students received 6 weeks of intensive prelaw training during the summer at seven law schools selected by CLEO to run these institutes. About 99 percent of these students completed the institutes and were admitted to law schools. They joined more than 300 other CLEO students now in their second or third year of legal study.

Types of Benefits Provided: The CLEO program has two main components of direct service to students in addition to its services to the law schools: 6-week summer institutes of intensive legal study for prospective law students and annual fellowships of $1,750 to successful graduates of the summer institutes who attend law schools. Participating law schools also waive tuition and fees for these students.

Program Effectiveness: In the past 15 years, CLEO has helped 4,000 students from disadvantaged backgrounds gain admission to law schools. As of June 1985, 2,000 CLEO students had successfully completed law school (see E.1).

Table I
SUMMARY OF AWARDS AND EXPENSES FOR CLEO,
ACADEMIC YEARS 1984-85 and 1985-86

	Academic Year 1984-85(est.)*		Academic Year 1985-86(est.)*	
	Amount	Number of Students	Amount	Number of Students
New Awards	$210,000	210	$668,500	328
Continuations	328,000	327	367,500	210
Summer Institutes	210,000	200	210,000	200
Administrative Costs	252,000	—	254,000	
Total	$1,000,000	737	$1,500,000	792

*/ Funds for academic year 1984-85 were appropriated in FY 1984, whereas funds for academic year 1985-86 were appropriated in FY 1985.

D. Highlights of Activities

During its first 2 years of operation, the program was funded solely from private sources. With Federal assistance, the program gained visibility and demonstrated its effectiveness in training disadvantaged persons for successful careers in the legal profession. Because the Administration believes that legal training for disadvantaged persons should attract support from businesses and other organizations that have a direct interest in training or employing CLEO fellows, the Administration has proposed elimination of this program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY
(CFDA No. 84.094)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part B, as amended by P.L. 98-374 (20 U.S.C. 1134d-1134g) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$60,000,000 1/	$12,000,000
1982	14,000,000	10,560,000
1983	14,000,000	11,920,000
1984	14,000,000	13,500,000
1985	Indefinite	14,250,000

Purpose: To assist graduate and professional students who demonstrate financial need. Fellowships may be awarded to support students in the following categories: (1) Graduate and Professional Opportunity Fellowships, awarded to individuals from groups who are underrepresented in graduate or professional study; (2) Public Service Education Fellowships, awarded to persons who plan to begin or continue a career in public service; and (3) Mining Fellowships, awarded to persons who plan to study domestic mining and mineral fuel conservation.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships are intended to meet the following objectives:

- To provide access to graduate and professional education for qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate education;
- To meet national employment needs for well-trained individuals, particularly minorities and women, in career fields of high national priority; and
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 600 new students, maintain 800 continuation students, and graduate 600 minority and women students in high quality professional and academic programs.

Public Service Fellowships are intended to meet the following objectives:

- To provide access to graduate education in the public service areas for 350 qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate education;

- To increase the representation of minorities and women at the highest levels of public service, especially at the State and local levels; and

- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 150 new students, maintain 200 continuation students, and graduate 150 minority and women students in high-quality public service programs.

Because no funds were appropriated for Mining Fellowships for FY 1985, the goals for this program have not been established.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships:

- Grantees recruited 1,428 minority students and women for fellowships in the fields of study selected during the peer review process.

- More than half of the fellowships were awarded in the physical sciences, engineering, and life sciences.

- The program awarded $1,400,000 in fellowships to 16 historically black colleges and universities in the FY 1985 competition.

Public Service Fellowships:

- The program encouraged practical experience and internships in public administration positions as an integral part of the curriculum for master's in public administration programs.

- The composition of the students participating in the program has changed from predominantly white men to predominantly women and minority men.

- The program supported seven historically black colleges and universities by awarding about $260,400 in fellowships to students at those institutions under the FY 1985 competition.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: In FY 1985, the Department awarded fellowship stipends based on financial need up to a maximum of $4,500 per 12-month period. It also gave an institutional allowance of $3,900 per year to each fellow enrolled in the program. Fellows must be full-time students and ordinarily cannot have the fellowships renewed beyond a 36-month period.

Program Scope

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships:

From FY 1985 funds, 154 grants totaling $11,750,000 were made to colleges and universities to support 883 students in their second or third year of full-time graduate or professional study, and to support another 573 new students beginning study during 1985-86. The fellows are expected to study in academic and professional areas in roughly the same proportions as they have previously.

Table 1
DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS,
BY SUBJECT AREA, FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1984-85

Subject Area	Number of Awards	Percent of Total
Physical Sciences	207	14.2
Engineering	174	12.0
Life Sciences	366	25.2
Social Sciences	195	13.3
Psychology	116	8.0
Humanities	23	1.5
Math and Computer Sciences	63	4.4
Law	218	15.0
Business	73	5.0
Education	21	1.4
	1,456	100.0

Source: See E.1

On the basis of 5 years of program experience, it is expected that the distribution of 1985 fellows by sex and race will be similar to the FY 1984 distribution, which was as follows:

Table 2
DISTRIBUTION OF FELLOWS IN THE GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY PROGRAM,
BY RACE/ETHNICITY, ACADEMIC YEAR 1984-85

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Fellows	Percent of Total
Black	598	49.8
Hispanic	266	22.2
Asian-American	61	5.1
American Indian	50	4.2
White Women	225	18.8
Total	1,200	100.0

NOTE: Women accounted for more than 50 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1984-85 program.

Source: See E.1

Public Service Fellowships:

From FY 1985 funds, 50 grants totaling $2,484,300 were made to colleges and universities to support 167 students in their second year of full-time graduate study, and to support another 155 new students beginning their first year of study during 1985-86. Eighty-eight new awards were extended for the second year 1986-87. Fellows supported under the program are restricted to study in the field of public administration or to closely related areas such as urban affairs, public policy analysis, international affairs, and environmental/natural resources administration.

The composition of the students participating in the program has changed from predominantly white male to predominantly women and minority males. The number of minority and female participants is expected to increase gradually. The FY 1984 distribution is as follows:

Table 3
DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAM, BY RACE/ETHNICITY, FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1984-85

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Fellows	Percent of Total
White		
Men	83	32
Women	99	38
Black	42	16
Hispanic	27	10.4
Asian-American	7	2.6
American Indian	1	1
Total	259	100.0

NOTE: Women accounted for about 63 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1984-85 program.

SOURCE: See E.1

Program Effectiveness

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships:

Final reports received during the fall of 1984 indicate that 73 students were awarded Ph.D.'s, and 200 students were awarded master's degrees or the first professional degree in law.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The doctoral degrees were earned in the areas shown in Table 4:

Table 4
DISTRIBUTION OF PH.D.'S, BY SUBJECT AREA,
ACADEMIC YEAR 1982-83

Subject Area	Ph.D.'s.	Percent of Total
Life Sciences	23	31.5
Physical Sciences	24	32.8
Engineering/Computer Science	12	16.4
Social Sciences	12	16.4
Other Professions	2	2.9
	73	100.0

Source: See E.1

Public Service Fellowships:

In academic year 1984-85, an estimated 150 public service fellows received master's degrees in public administration or closely related fields. Institutional projections indicate that another 175 will be awarded a master's degree during 1985-86.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration requested no funds for the Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships Program for FY 1986. A variety of non-Federal sources of financial support are already available for minorities and women pursuing graduate study, especially in engineering and science, including support from postsecondary institutions, foundations, and other private sources. Federal financial assistance is available to graduate students through the Work-Study Program, the National Direct Student Loan Program, and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

Moreover, there is no need for Federal encouragement of graduate study in public service. Many institutions already offer high-quality graduate programs in public administration, and there is a substantial supply of qualified persons to fill public service jobs. The number of master's degrees awarded in public service fields increased by 141.5 percent between academic years 1970-71 and 1978-79, and doctorates awarded in these fields increased by 106.7 percent during the same period. Graduate students in public service fields are eligible to receive Federal financial assistance through the Work-Study Program, the National Direct Student Loan Program, and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Under the consolidated Part B, Section (e), at least as much money must be spent each year on Public Service Fellowships, Mining Fellowships, and Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships as was spent in FY 1979 for each of these categories.

FULBRIGHT-HAYS TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA Nos. 84.019, 84.020, 84.021, 84.022)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act), Section 102(b)(6), P.L. 87-256 (22 U.S.C. 2452 (b)(6)) and Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Sections 104(b)(2) and (3), P.L. 83-480 (7 U.S.C. 1691) (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	1/	$6,200,000
1982		4,800,000
1983		5,000,000
1984		5,000,000
1985		5,500,000

Purpose: This program provides for faculty research abroad, foreign curriculum consultants, group projects abroad, and doctoral dissertation research abroad.

Faculty Research Abroad: To strengthen programs of international studies at universities and colleges by providing opportunities for research and study abroad in foreign language and area studies, by enabling faculty members to keep current in their specialties, by facilitating curriculum updating, and by helping to improve teaching methods and materials.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants: To enable institutions to bring specialists from other countries to the United States to help plan and develop curricula in modern foreign languages and area studies.

Group Projects Abroad: To help educational institutions improve their programs in modern foreign languages and area studies.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: To provide opportunities for graduate students to do full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area studies and to develop research knowledge and capability about areas of the world not widely studied in U.S. institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The objective for FY 1985 was to award project grants and fellowships within the prescribed schedule.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Faculty Research Abroad: Following a national competition including domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, the Department made 35 awards to institutions for individual Faculty Research Fellowships.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants: Twenty-four applications, representing 15 states, for the Foreign Curriculum Consultants program were received. All applications were reviewed by a panel of external academic experts, by Department of Education staff, and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which resulted in six awards.

Group Projects Abroad: Ninety-one applications were received from 29 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for Group Projects Abroad. All applications were reviewed by a panel of experts, Department staff and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which resulted in 41 awards.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: After a national competition that involved domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, 113 awards were made for individual research fellowships.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The following awards were made in FY 1985:

- Faculty Research Abroad: 35 fellowships at 31 institutions for a total amount of $929,714.
- Foreign Curriculum Consultants: 6 projects for a total of $108,965.
- Group Projects Abroad: 41 projects for a total of $2,983,868; 26 projects used U.S. dollars in the amount of $1,954,594 and 15 projects were supported under the U.S.-owned foreign currency category for a total of $1,024,274.
- Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: 113 fellowships to 31 institutions for a total of $1,753,534.
- Special Bilateral Projects: 9 projects for a total of $930,000 in Italy, Israel, South Korea, China, Brazil, Liberia, India, and Pakistan.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

- The Administration did not request funds for these activities for FY 1986, which reflected the Administration's effort to curtail Federal discretionary expenditures and to encourage individuals, institutions, businesses, and other organizations to provide a greater share of support for international education and foreign language studies.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead, (202) 245-9691

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

Note

1. Indefinite authorization for these activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES
(CFDA Nos. 84.015, 84.016, 84.017, 84.153)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI, as amended by P.L. 96-374 (20 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$52,750,000	$19,800,000
1982	30,600,000	19,200,000
1983	30,600,000	21,000,000
1984	30,600,000	25,800,000
1985	87,500,000	26,500,000

Purposes:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs: (1) To help institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages, and (2) to help associations and organizations to develop projects that will make an especially significant contribution to strengthening and improving undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers: To promote instruction in those modern foreign languages and area and international studies critical to national needs by supporting the establishment, strengthening, and operation of such programs at colleges and universities.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: To meet the needs of the United States for experts in modern foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs by supporting fellowships for advanced study at institutions for higher education.

International Research and Studies: To improve foreign language and area studies training through support of research and studies, experimentation, and development of specialized instructional materials.

Business and International Education Programs: To provide suitable international education and training for business personnel in various stages of professional development, and to promote education and training that will contribute to the ability of U.S. businesses to prosper in an international economy.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for these program components were as follows:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs:

- To strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages;
- To strengthen the acquisition of knowledge and skills in professional fields that have an international component, such as agriculture, business, education, law, and journalism, or that develop skills for the analysis of critical issues such as economic development, technology utilization, national security, or international trade; and
- To increase the use of computers to teach modern foreign languages and to collect and analyze information about critical international issues.

National Resource Centers:

- To urge grantees to adopt standards and testing procedures compatible with the most recent standards adopted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign languages;
- To initiate or strengthen linkages between language and area studies and professional schools;
- To strengthen the language programs by increasing to 10 hours of instruction per week in grantees' introductory and intermediate language skill courses, and add advanced third- and fourth-year regular language skill courses; and
- To initiate or expand outreach activities in teacher education through technical assistance and inservice training in language and area studies and international education.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships:

- To award fellowships to students who combine language and area studies with professional studies;
- To award fellowships to students studying the less commonly taught languages and cultures of non-Western countries; and
- To award fellowships to students or faculty members enrolled in cooperative, advanced, intensive foreign language programs in the United States or abroad.

Business and International Education:

- To promote innovation and improvement in international business education curriculums and to increase the international skills of the business community through linkages between institutions of higher education and the business community.

The International Research and Studies Program:

- To emphasize research in the use of computers for improving foreign language instruction;
- To emphasize research in foreign language acquisition and improved teaching methodologies for foreign languages; and
- To improve foreign language proficiency testing and the development of instructional materials for uncommonly taught languages.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs:

- All funded projects included a component designed to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in modern foreign languages.
- Two funded projects, including one submitted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, incorporated an international perspective into the core program of professional studies for teachers. The Educational Testing Service will conduct a series of workshops to train teachers of French, German, and Spanish in oral proficiency testing techniques. These projects were funded for a second phase in 1985.
- Many projects included computer-assisted instruction in foreign languages, or use interactive TV instructional systems for the teaching of international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers

- Additional funds were allocated for work on proficiency testing using the most recent guidance from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Proficiency testing was included as a priority activity for the centers applying for FY 1985 funding.
- Technical assistance for applications for FY 1985 stressed the need to improve intrauniversity linkages, particularly with professional schools.
- Additional funds were allocated for intensifying introductory and intermediate language instruction or for adding third- or fourth-year language skill courses.
- Additional funds were devoted to teacher education activities and outreach in the teacher education field will be a priority in FY 1985 funding.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships:

- Combining language and area studies with professional school programs has been made a program funding priority. Data are not yet available on the actual award patterns.

- At least 75 percent of the fellowship awards were for the less commonly taught non-Western languages.

- Fellowship awards for students and faculty to participate in summer intensive language programs were increased, as a percentage of all fellowships, from 10.2 percent for the summer of 1984 to 13.8 percent for summer 1985.

Business and International Education:

- All grantees have linkage agreements with the business community involved in export related trade or international economic activities.

The International Research and Studies Program:

Funded projects include those focusing on language proficiency testing, developing new instructional materials, use of computers in language instruction, and improving teaching methodologies and language acquisition. One project will develop a guidebook on how to evaluate foreign language programs at the college level.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

National Resource Centers: In FY 1985, 93 centers were funded; 83 of them were comprehensive graduate and undergraduate and 10 were undergraduate.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: New awards for fellowships were made to 114 programs representing the equivalent of 842 academic year fellowships; about 14 percent of the funds will be used for summer awards for advanced intensive language training.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 AER for latest information).

Table 1

A SUMMARY OF FUNDING BY PROGRAM AREAS, FISCAL YEARS 1983, 1984, and 1985

	Year					
Program	1983		1984		1985	
	No. of Awards	Total Funding	No. of Awards	Total Funding	No. of Awards	Total Funding
Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs	54	$ 2,300,000	71	$ 3,000,000	67	$ 3,100,000
National Resource Centers	91	10,600,000	91	12,100,000	93	12,200,000
Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships	750	6,000,000	800	7,200,000	842	7,550,000
International Research and Studies	22	1,005,142	35	1,475,442	27	1,447,133
Business and International Education Program	23	1,089,000	37	2,000,000	35	2,200,000
Total, All Programs	307	$20,994,142	351	$25,775,442	336	$26,497,133

Source: See E.1

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration did not request funds for these activities for FY 1986. Many of the institutions receiving assistance under this program have done so for many years, and these activities are now well-established parts of their curriculums. The Administration believes that the institutions themselves should assume full funding responsibility.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead, (202) 245-9691

Program Studies : Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-8281

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.055)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VIII (20 U.S.C. 1133 - 1133b.) as amended. P.L. 97-35 authorizations were for 1982-1984 only. (Title V, Section 516 [h]) (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$35,000,000	$23,000,000
1982	20,000,000	14,400,000
1983	20,000,000	14,400,000
1984	20,000,000	14,400,000
1985	35,000,000	14,400,000

Purposes: To provide Federal support for (1) the planning, establishment, and development of cooperative education projects in higher education institutions to demonstrate or explore the feasibility and value of innovative methods of comprehensive institutional cooperative education; and (2) research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education programs have alternating or parallel periods of academic study and employment related to the student's academic program or professional goals.

Eligibility: Accredited institutions of higher education and consortiums of such institutions. Other nonprofit agencies and organizations are also eligible for training and research grants.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To stimulate institutions to initiate schoolwide cooperative education for all students,
- To stimulate the development of cooperative education programs for newly participating institutions, and
- To provide training grants to help faculty members and administrators to design and implement cooperative education programs and to emphasize the improvement of training techniques.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985 the following activities were funded:

- Seventeen comprehensive (all-institution) demonstration grants brought the total to date to 62.
- New awards dropped from 152 in FY 1984 to 123 in FY 1985, but continuations increased from 32 to 55.
- Ten training grants were awarded, up from 9 in FY 1984.

C. Costs and Benefits

Four categories of grants are provided under this program.

1. Administration Grants: These projects generally focus on a single department or cluster of departments in an institution of higher education. Funds are used to develop and strengthen cooperative education programs and to strengthen and expand linkages with employers (and local high school cooperative education programs).
2. Comprehensive Demonstration Grants: These large grants help institutions plan and initiate institution wide cooperative educational approaches to postsecondary programs of study.
3. Research Grants: These projects collect, study, and disseminate information on cooperative education programs and practices (none was funded in FY 1985).
4. Training Grants: These projects provide institution program directors and faculty and business professionals with information on how to administer and expand their cooperative education programs.

Program Scope: In FY 1985, according to the program files, 344 applications were submitted by eligible applicants requesting a total of $66,917,832; slightly over half of the applicants--178--received awards from the $14.4 million appropriation. Of these, 151 were administration grants, totaling $9,400,000; 17 were comprehensive demonstration grants, totaling $4,100,000; and 10 were training grants, totaling $900,000. Grants totaling $4,675,000 were awarded to 57 private institutions of higher education; $9,374,000 was awarded to 119 public institutions; and 2 grants, totaling $311,000, were awarded to nonprofit organizations (see Table 1).

Tables 1 and 3 together provide a detailed look at award recipients over a 3-year period. Given the constant funding ($14,400,000) over this period, fewer institutions received funding and the distribution of grants changed. In particular, 4-year public institutions, which had received 42 percent of the grants in FY 1983 obtained 30 percent in 1985. Grants to 4-year private institutions increased over the 3-year period both in number and average size of award.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Distributions, especially average award levels to institutions classified by race and ethnicity, also changed over the 3-year period (Tables 2 and 4), but no pattern is apparent.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS BY TYPE AND CONTROL FOR COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM FISCAL YEARS 1983 to 1985

	1983			1984			1985		
Type and Control	No.	Total Amount	%	No.	Total Amount	%	No.	Total Amount	%
Public									
2-year	70	$4,719,000	33	65	$5,146,000	36	64	$5,094,000	35
4-year	71	6,119,000	42	58	5,305,000	37	55	4,280,000	30
Private									
2-year	4	196,000	1	5	183,000	1	5	244,000	2
4-year	48	3,125,000	22	55	3,556,000	25	52	4,431,000	31
Public & Private Org.	3	240,000	2	1	210,000	1	2	311,000	2
TOTAL	196	$14,400,000	100	184	$14,400,000	100	178	$14,360,000*	100

*Based on funds obligated in FY 1985.

Source: See E.1

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS BY RACE/ETHNICITY FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEARS 1983 TO 1985

	1983			1984			1985		
Race/Ethnicity	No.	Total Amount	%	No.	Total Amount	%	No.	Total Amount	%
Historically black	7	$ 614	4	6	$ 342	2	5	$ 357	3
Predominantly black	4	536	4	6	466	3	6	464	3
American Indian	0	0	0	1	50	1	2	130	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	2	89	1	2	272	2	1	64	1
White	183	13,161	91	166	13,270	92	164	13,345	92
TOTAL	196	$14,400	100	181	$14,400	100	178	$14,360*	100

*Based on funds obligated in FY 1985.

Source: See E.1

Table 3

AVERAGE AWARDS IN THE COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM BY INSTITUTION TYPE, FISCAL YEARS 1983 to 1985

Type and Control	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
Public			
2-Year	$67,371	$79,169	$79,594
4-Year	86,183	91,466	77,818
Private			
2-Year	48,050	36,600	48,800
4-Year	65,104	64,655	85,211

Source: See E.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

AVERAGE AWARDS TO SELECTED INSTITUTIONS SERVING
MINORITY STUDENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1983 TO 1985

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985
Historically black	$ 87,729	$56,933	$71,400
Predominantly black	134,075	93,220	73,333
American Indian	0	50,000	65,000
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	64,800
Hispanic	44,500	90,666	64,000

Source: See E.1

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available (see Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1981 for most recent information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1985. With more than one-third of the Nation's postsecondary institutions supporting cooperative education and with more widespread recognition of the benefits of this educational approach, there is no longer a pressing need for Federal encouragement and stimulation in this area.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., FY 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stanley B. Patterson, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.142)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Housing Act of 1950, Title IV, as amended (12 U.S.C 1749-1749c); Participation Sales Act of 1966 (12 U.S.C. 1717(c)); Independent Agencies Appropriation Acts of 1964 (12 U.S.C. 1749 d), 1967, 1968, and 1976; Department of Education Organization Act, Sec. 306; Department of Education Appropriation Acts of 1984 and 1985 (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation		
		Annual	Permanent	Loan Authority
1981	Indefinite	0	$279,000	$110,000,000
1982	"	0	232,000	40,000,000
1983	"	0	40,000	40,000,000
1984	"	0	0	40,000,000
1985	"	0	0	40,000,000

Purpose: To alleviate severe shortages of student and faculty housing and related facilities through the support of new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation and to reduce fuel consumption and other operating costs of existing facilities. Recently, loans have been limited to especially cost-effective energy conservation rehabilitation, facility renovations, and relief of severe local housing shortages.

Eligibility: The College Housing Program enables the Secretary of Education to make direct Federal loans to higher education institutions and certain other eligible college housing agencies at 3 percent interest. The funds are made available through a revolving fund financed with U.S. Treasury borrowings and proceeds from the sale of public securities (participation certificates backed by pools of existing college housing loans) marketed through the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA).

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for the College Housing Program were as follows:

- o To provide low-interest loans to institutions of postsecondary education for the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of housing and related facilities in order to relieve severe housing and related facility needs in the higher education community and to conserve energy in dormitories and related facilities.

A. Objectives (continued)

- To administer the annual loan competition in an accurate and sound manner and to ensure that awards are made on schedule.
- To continue efforts in credit management improvement to ensure that sound loans are made and to ensure that the Federal interest is protected. Continue to improve the verification and validation controls of the program.
- To support the objectives of the President's Executive Order 12320 to assist historically black colleges and universities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1985, the Department awarded $40 million in new loan commitments support of 10 housing construction projects and 16 energy conservation projects. The Department used engineering consultants to review and monitor projects to ensure project feasibility and compliance with architectural, engineering, and other building design. The loan competition was carried out in an accurate, sound, and timely manner--in part, because computer program was used to rank applications.
- The Department of Education improved its credit management as follows:
  - Used the government field expense allotments, a legislative set-aside, to monitor projects through the construction period;
  - Continued to take steps to ensure the financial soundness of new loans using such resources as Federal Reserve Bank delinquency listings, financial status reports, and regulatory provisions relating to institutional eligibility and loan cancellation;
  - Completed an inventory of all closed projects to ensure prompt and proper billing by the Federal Reserve Bank, cancelled inactive loans, and enforced policy requiring institutions to begin construction within 18 months of loan reservation;
  - Continued a procedure to ensure prompt delivery of notes and bonds to the Federal Reserve Bank; and
  - Conducted more in-depth credit reviews with special conditions when necessary on loan agreements.
- The Department has exceeded the regulatory 10 percent set-aside for historically black colleges and universities each year that it has administered the program.

C. Costs and Benefits

New Loan Commitments: For each fiscal year from 1983 through 1985, $40 million was annually directed by Congress to be made available for new loans.

Table 1 shows the distribution of loan commitments for those years. These commitments were supported with the resources of the program's revolving fund and required no appropriation. Each year, approximately three-quarters of the funds have been committed for housing construction, while one-quarter has been committed for energy conservation projects.

Table 1

LOAN COMMITMENTS OF THE COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
FY 1983 to FY 1985

Type of Award	Year of Commitment					
	1983		1984		1985	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Housing Construction	13	$29,978,000	11	$30,000,000	10	$30,413,000
ergy Conservation	15	10,022,000	18	10,000,000	16	9,587,000
Total	28	$40,000,000	29	$40,000,000	26	$40,000,000

Source: See E.1

Indirect or Off-Budget Costs: The Federal Government absorbs the difference between the approximately 3 percent interest paid by institutions on their college housing loans and the prevailing interest rate for long-term Treasury borrowing. As noted, these funds are made available through a revolving fund. Hence, most of this program's cost is off-budget and does not appear as a direct expense under the program account. The off-budget cost exceeds $200 million. The revolving fund, however, actually realizes a small profit because it reimburses the Treasury at a rate of only 2.75 percent--less than the average interest returned by institutional borrowers.

Servicing Existing Commitments: The principal liability ($451.5 million) on GNMA participation certificates, marketed to the public in 1967-68 to raise loan capital, was completely amortized in FY 1985. Available program resources (i.e., loan repayments and other income in excess of new loan volume and program operating costs) are now planned to be used to repay Treasury borrowings. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

AGGREGATE LOAN PORTFOLIO OF THE COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM FY 1983 to FY 1985

	1983	1984	1985
Selected Assets			
Outstanding Loan Volume	$3,025,464,000	$2,675,520,000	$2,300,427,000
GNMA Trust Funds	89,207,000	337,357,000	451,504,000
Selected Liabilities			
Outstanding Treasury Borrowing	2,687,325,000	2,687,325,000	2,625,325,000
Outstanding GNMA Liability	451,504,000	451,504,000	451,504,000
Defaulted Loan Volume*	114,700,000	105,561,000	84,456,000

*This amount represents a potential offset against the outstanding loan volume.

Source: E.1

In FY 1985, the major portion of loan repayments and other income was used to pay program operating costs. These costs included the following:

- Interest expenses of $68,004,000 on borrowed Treasury funds used to make loans in prior years. (This expense was $70,218,000 in FY 1984.)
- Interest expenses of $28,138,000 on GNMA participation certificates (the proceeds of which were also used to make prior year loans)—the same amount as in FY 1984.
- Principal transfers of $114,147,000 to the GNMA participation sales fund. These funds have been used to amortize the outstanding principal debt on participation certificates that will be redeemed in FYs 1987 and 1988. (This transfer payment was $248,151,000 in FY 1984.) The Department was able to make such large fund transfers in FYs 1984 and 1985 because of large discounted prepayment collections in those years.
- A total of $259,000 for loan servicing, facilities management, and audit and inspection expenses. (This cost was $507,000 in FY 1984.)

D. Highlights of Activities

Because enrollments are no longer rapidly expanding, there is no need for a Federal program. In line with the Administration's overall effort to reduce Federal discretionary expenditures for nonessential purposes and to reduce Federal borrowing, thereby controlling inflation and relieving pressure on financial markets, no authority for new loan commitments in FY 1986 was requested.

In both FY 1984 and FY 1985, the Department made intensive efforts to collect debts. Largely because of a newly authorized prepayment discounting provision, about $360.9 million was collected in FY 1984, a $177.8 million increase over FY 1983 collections. FY 1985 collections totaled $277.1 million.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Program Files, FY 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.001)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part C, Section 734, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1132d-3) (expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	$26,000,000
1982	"	25,500,000
1983	"	25,000,000
1984	"	24,500,000
1985	"	18,775,000

Purpose: To reduce the cost of borrowing from non-Federal sources for the construction, reconstruction, and renovation of needed academic facilities. The applicant must finance at least 10 percent of the project through non-Federal sources, must be unable to secure as favorable a loan from other sources, and must undertake the project in an economical manner. No State may receive more than 12.5 percent of the annual appropriation and the aggregate principal may not exceed $5 million per fiscal year. The program appropriations represent the difference between the commercial rate on a loan and an interest rate of 3 percent.

Eligibility: Higher education institutions or higher education building agencies are eligible.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The objective for FY 1985 was to meet the Federal commitment on 619 remaining commercial loans for construction projects approved prior to FY 1974, to make no new commitments to subsidize additional loans, and to reduce interest subsidies.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- All loan subsidy commitments were met in FY 1985 with available appropriated funds and carryover funds.

- The final remaining loan issues (of a total of 711 approved loans) for which loan subsidies were negotiated and agreed to by the Department were put into pay status in FY 1985.

TABLE 1

IMPACT DATA ON ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS ESTIMATED FOR FY 1985 TO FY 1987

	1985	1986	1987
Total number of loans approved for subsidy, active, and in pay status	619	611	599
Total number of loans paid off, terminated, or withdrawn during year	6	8	12
Average amount of interest subsidy	$40,354	$38,275	$[illegible],101
Total outstanding volume of loans for which interest subsidies are made	$1,180,000,000	$1,150,000,000	$1,117,000,000

Source: See E.1

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: From the program's inception in FY 1970 through 1973, 711 loans valued at about $1.4 billion in principal amount were approved for subsidy. The Federal subsidy payments have exceeded $291 million through FY 1985. In FY 1985, 619 of these grants were in active pay status (see Table 1) As can be seen from Table 1, the number of grants in active pay status is to drop slightly from 619 in 1985 to 611 in 1986. Outstanding loan volume, along with the average interest subsidy, will decline slightly over the 1985 to 1987 period.

Program Effectiveness: No studies have been conducted on the overall impact of this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

Appropriations, as needed, will be requested to meet the Federal commitment to pay interest subsidies on the construction loans still remaining in payment status--all of which were approved prior to 1974. In FY 1986, program funds will support subsidies against the remaining loan volume of $1.15 billion. No new loan subsidy commitments will be entered into. Appropriation requests in future years will decrease gradually as the loan principal subject to interest subsidy is gradually retired.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Program Files, FY 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in progress or planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND RENOVATION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES
(CFDA No. 13.594)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part C, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1132d et seq.); Participation Sales Act of 1966 (12 U.S.C. 1717[c]) and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act of 1968. (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation[1] Annual	Appropriation[1] Permanent
1981	$80,000,000	$ 1,656,000	$ 1,091,000
1982	80,000,000	11,096,000[2]	37,783,000
1983	80,000,000	20,143,000	134,000
1984	80,000,000	19,846,000	0
1985	80,000,000	14,094,000	0

Purpose: To assist higher education institutions in obtaining adequate academic facilities, the Secretary is authorized to make or to ensure low-interest loans for the construction, reconstruction, or renovation of academic facilities.

The Department awards loans subject to the following stipulations: (1) not less than 20 percent of the development cost of the facility must be financed from non-Federal sources (this requirement may be waived for schools qualified as developing institutions under HEA Title III); (2) the applicant must have been unable to secure a loan of this size from other sources upon terms and conditions as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this program; (3) construction must be undertaken economically; (4) in the case of a project to construct an infirmary or other facility designed to provide primarily outpatient care to students and institutional personnel, no financial assistance will be provided under Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950; (5) the loan must be repaid within 50 years; and (6) the applicant must pay an interest rate of 4 percent.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies (that is, agencies empowered by a State to issue tax-exempt bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education) are eligible for loans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In FY 1985, the Department's objectives for this program were to increase the amount of collections on defaulted loans and to improve debt collection efforts.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Collections on defaulted loans for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 totaled $25,964,000, while debt collections totaled $29,154,000.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The program requires two appropriations: (1) The Annual Definite Appropriation covers insufficiencies from Treasury borrowings. The Treasury rate is determined by the average yield for 30-year Treasury certificates for the month preceding the fiscal year, which for FY 1985 was 12.5 percent. Institutions are now paying only 3 percent interest, but if any new loans were approved, they would be 4 percent loans. (2) The Permanent Indefinite Appropriation is for participation certificates that were sold to the public at interest rates between 4.75 percent and 6.45 percent and average about 6 percent. Again, the colleges pay only 3 percent interest on their loans.

Program Scope: As of FY 1985, loans totaling more than $640 million had been made to more than 660 institutions.

Through FY 1985, Congress had appropriated $679,370,000 in Treasury loan capital, with permanent, indefinite appropriations of nearly $57 million further provided for interest insufficiencies on participation certificates sold to the public in 1967 and 1968 to raise additional loan capital. Of the millions in total participation certificates sold, $108 million remains outstanding. These certificates will come due in FY 1987 and FY 1988. Now on deposit at GNMA toward that remaining balance is $34.1 million. Investment earnings on the GNMA deposits have been used to pay the interest insufficiencies for both 1984 and 1985.

Program Effectiveness: No studies have been conducted of the overall impact of this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

No new construction loans are planned. Prior to FY 1982, the unobligated balance of the loan account was to cover deficits in the program's annual operating expenses. In 1982, however, the unobligated balance of the fund was depleted by new loan activity. Appropriations are now required annually to fund operating deficits.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Program files, FY 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in progress or planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

TERRITORIAL TEACHER TRAINING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM--PROJECT GRANTS TO TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS (CFDA No. 84.124)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1978, Title XV, Part C, Section 1525, P.L. 95-561, as reauthorized by the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$2,000,000	$1,800,000
1982	2,000,000	960,000
1983	2,000,000	960,000
1984	2,000,000	1,000,000
1985	2,000,000	2,000,000

Purpose: To provide assistance for teacher training in schools in Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands through grants to State education agencies (SEAs) in each territory.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objective for this program continued to be to distribute grants to upgrade the skills and capacities of teachers in the territories.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded five grants ranging from $130,000 to $930,000 for school year 1985-86.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In academic year 1984-85, about 2,000 teachers received training at an average cost of about $500 per teacher.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available on improvements in teacher skills or capacities resulting from training activities supported by this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

There have been no Federal studies of the program.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Haroldie Spriggs, (202) 254-5833

Program Studies : Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CDFA No. 84.034)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title I, P.L. 91-600, as amended by the LSCA Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-480 (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.)(expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1981	$150,000,000	$62,500,000
1982	65,000,000	60,000,000
1983	65,000,000	60,000,000
1984	65,000,000	65,000,000
1985	75,000,000	75,000,000 2/

Purpose: To establish, extend, and improve public library services to areas and populations that lack these services; to make public library services accessible to persons who, by reason of distance, residence, handicap, age, literacy level, limited English-speaking proficiency, or other disadvantage, are unable to benefit from public library services available to their regular clientele; to help libraries serve as community information referral centers; to strengthen the capacity of the State library to meet the library needs of the people of the State; to support and expand the services of major urban resource libraries and metropolitan libraries that serve as national or regional resource centers; and to strengthen the capacity of libraries to keep up with rapidly changing information technologies.

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for LSCA Title I grants. Besides the 50 States, this group includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department had three principal objectives for this program:

- To encourage the extension of public library services for underserved or unserved counties and small towns nationally;
- To increase the capacity of State library administrative agencies to provide statewide library services; and
- To encourage innovative library services to disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, physically handicapped, State institutionalized, and elderly persons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- To encourage innovative library services to disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, physically handicapped, State institutionalized, and elderly persons.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Most of the Nation's unserved and underserved areas for library service have been reached by increasing the service capacity of State and local library agencies. More than 96 percent of the Nation's population now has access to library services.

- Nearly 75 percent of the program's funds were used to provide services to areas that had no library services or had inadequate services, to strengthen metropolitan and major urban libraries as resource centers, and to strengthen State administration of the program.

- More than 25 percent of the program's funds were used to provide innovative library services to selected population groups.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Since the program's inception 28 years ago, more than $1 billion in program funds has been spent to increase the public's access to public libraries and to improve basic information services to special population groups. The numbers of persons in selected population groups in FY 1985 were estimated as follows:

Category	Number Reached
Disadvantaged	3,500,000
Limited English-speaking proficiency	3,000,000
Physically handicapped	1,000,000
Institutionalized person in correctional environments, etc.	900,000
Elderly	900,000
Total	9,300,000

Types of Benefits Provided: Services include radio reading for the blind; classes in English as a second language; materials to help the mentally retarded cope with public transportation, job hunting, ordering in a restaurant and so on; book collections at senior citizen centers; books-by-mail program for rural residents; and literacy programs for functionally illiterate adults.

Program Effectiveness: No new data are available (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

New regulations were published on August 16, 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. LSCA Grant Reports

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program Studies : Arthur Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.
2. Under P.L. 98-480, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives). (See Chapter 609.)

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.035)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title III, P.L. 91-600, as amended by the LSCA Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-480, (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1981	$20,000,000	$12,000,000
1982	15,000,000	11,520,000
1983	15,000,000	11,520,000
1984	15,000,000	15,000,000
1985	20,000,000	18,000,000 2/

Purpose: The purposes of this program are to establish, develop, operate, and expand local, regional, or interstate networks of libraries, including school libraries, academic libraries, public libraries, and special libraries and information centers. These networks are designed to coordinate library resources and to improve services for special clientele.

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for Title III grants. Besides the 50 States, this group includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam. The States are also required to develop a statewide resource sharing plan.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To encourage the establishment and expansion of networks of libraries and to promote coordination of informational resources among schools, public libraries, academic and special libraries, and information centers.

- To monitor the initial development by the State library administrative agencies of statewide resource sharing plans to address the issues of bibliographic access to computerized data bases and other communication systems for information exchange; to develop delivery systems for exchanging materials among libraries; to project computer and other technological needs for resource sharing; and to analyze and evaluate the States' library resource sharing needs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- More than 50 percent of program funds were used to continue support of computerized bibliographic data bases, both for current materials and for retrospective conversion of older materials. Generally, these funds are used by States and local libraries to link with major nationwide bibliographic data bases.

- Because of the cost-sharing benefits derived from these projects, 28 States now provide State aid for public and multitype library systems and networks; about $90 million was appropriated in FY 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Since 1967 when this program was initiated, more than $100 million in Federal funds has been expended for projects linking libraries through telecommunication systems to data bases, other resource sharing projects not linked to automation, and training library personnel to handle resource sharing and the technological advances in data collection and transmission.

Benefits Provided: Activities at the State and local public library level are directed toward improving public access to educational and informational services by libraries. Typical projects include improved rapid communications systems to link libraries with microcomputers; materials delivery systems; production of location tools such as computer-based lists of library holdings; computer-based information retrieval and processing systems; and training of personnel for these activities.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

New regulations were published on August 16, 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. LSCA Title III Grant Reports.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program Studies : Arthur Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes

1. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

2. Under P.L. 98-480, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives). (See Chapter 609.)

COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ELIGIBLE, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA No. 84.005)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A; P.L. 89-329 as amended, by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374 and by Section 516 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1029) (expires September 30, 1986). 1/

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 2/
1981	$10,000,000	$2,988,000
1982	5,000,000	1,920,000
1983	5,000,000	1,920,000
1984	5,000,000	0
1985	35,000,000	0

Purpose: To assist and encourage institutions of higher education and other eligible institutions to acquire library materials. Funds may also be used for the establishment and maintenance of library networks for resource sharing.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, this program received no funding.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

None.

C. Costs and Benefits

The program was not funded in FY 1985.

D. Highlights of Activities

The program has been terminated.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417 (b)]

None

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Studies : Arthur Kirschenbaum, (202)245-8307

Notes

1. The program was extended for 1 year through FY 1986 under GEPA.
2. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

LIBRARY CAREER TRAINING--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND LIBRARY ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.036)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II-B, P.L. 89-329 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Sections 201, 202, and 222, and by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022 and 1032) (expires September 30, 1986). 1/

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 2/	Appropriation 3/
1981	$10,000,000	$667,000
1982	1,200,000	640,000
1983	1,200,000	640,000
1984	1,200,000	640,000
1985	35,000,000	640,000

Purpose: To assist institutions of higher education and library organizations and agencies in training persons in the principles and practices of librarianship and information science, including new techniques of information transfer and communication technology.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objective for FY 1985 was to increase opportunities for members of underrepresented groups to obtain training and retraining in librarianship, including training beyond the master's degree level.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The 1985 appropriation of $640,000 for this program supported 72 fellowships aimed primarily at upgrading the professional skills of women and members of minority groups. The fellowships were distributed as follows: doctoral study, 11; post-master's study, 4; master's study, 57.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: From 1973 through 1984, 1,032 (70.3 percent) of the 1,468 awards went to members of minority groups. Women received 1,121 of the fellowships, (76.4 percent).

In FY 1984, the most recent year for which data are available, 56 women and 20 men received fellowships. Of the total receiving awards, 45 were members of minority groups.

Program Effectiveness: The Historical Survey of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships, 1965-82, a study by Dr. Mildred Lowe, was funded in 1983 by the Department of Education's Higher Education Act, Title II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, and completed in mid-1985. This study and annual reports from grantees indicate that program recipients had little difficulty in getting jobs or advancing to more senior positions following their studies. The study shows that one-third of all doctoral recipients in the study group are teaching or have taught in library and information science schools. Almost one-half of this group are senior faculty, and one-third are deans, directors, associate deans, and associate directors.

Since the program began in 1965, it has funded the following fellowships: 1,075 doctoral, 240 post-master's, 2,723 master's, 56 bachelor's, and 53 associate's for a total of 4,147.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files which contain narrative and fiscal reports, personal interviews, and professional literature.

2. Historical Survey of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships, 1965-1982 by Dr. Mildred Lowe, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Studies : Arthur Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. Program was extended 1 year under GEPA through FY 1986.

2. Authorization for HEA Title II, Part B, Sections 222, 223, 224.

3. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS-- DISCRETIONARY GRANTS AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER ELIGIBLE AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS
(CFDA No. 84.039)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II-B, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Section 201, and the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1033) (expires September 30, 1986) 1/

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization 2/	Appropriation 3/
1981	$10,000,000	$250,000
1982	1,200,000	240,000
1983	1,200,000	240,000
1984	1,200,000	240,000
1985	35,000,000	360,000

Purpose: To make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education and other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for (1) research or demonstration projects related to the improvement of libraries, or training in librarianship and information technology, and for (2) dissemination of information derived from such projects.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, institutions, or organizations.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the principal objectives for the programs were to monitor five ongoing contracts and to award three new contracts, which will (1) update a previous study of the role libraries play in literacy education, (2) conduct a demonstration project for the improvement of public library services to American Indians, and (3) demonstrate a statistical data-gathering model for State and public libraries.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The following projects were monitored:

  - "New Directions in Library and Information Science Education" is a study that presents a detailed description of the information environment (work settings, functions in which librarians are engaged, services they provide, and activities they perform) and lists librarians and information professional competencies by corresponding work activities. Sets of competencies were identified, described, and validated for 22 functions in 12 work settings.

  - "Diffusion of Innovation in Library and Information Science" is a project to identify innovations developed and adopted for use in library and information science, to trace the development of such innovations, to develop a model for planned diffusion, and to recommend options for building a diffusion network.

  - "The Historical Impact of Higher Education Act, Title II-B, Library Career Training" is a report that focuses on the contributions to library and information science profession by recipients of HEA II-B fellowships since the enactment of HEA in November 1965. The report, now available through the Education Resource Information Centers (ERIC), also includes an extensive bibliography.

  - "The Book in the Future" project resulted in a report to the Congress titled Books in Our Future.

- The Department monitored the contract "To Explore Procedures and Guidelines for Participation of a Variety of Associations in the Accreditation of Programs for Library and Information Science." The American Library Association, assisted by eight other interested associations and organizations, is developing a set of procedures and guidelines for evaluating programs prior to accreditation. The project will continue through March 1986.

- The Department awarded the following projects:

  - "Libraries and Literacy Education," awarded to the University of Wisconsin, Madison, will not only update an earlier study on the role(s) of libraries in literacy education, but will also determine or project an expanded role for libraries in literacy education, identify at least six exemplary literacy programs conducted by libraries, and assess the application and effectiveness of new technology in such literacy activities.

  - "Leadership Training, Guidance, and Direction for the Improvement of Public Library and Information Services to Native American Tribes," awarded to the University of Oklahoma, Office of Research Administration. It is a demonstration project to improve public library services to American Indians, including the training and retraining of persons in the principles and practices of, and the development and improvement of, public library and information services to American Indians. The project also seeks (1) to develop and disseminate short-term training models that can be replicated by other educational agencies in improving public library and information services to American Indians, and (2) to assist and counsel Indian tribes in improving, developing, and expanding such services.

- "The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection, A Pilot Project," awarded to the American Library Association, will demonstrate a statistical data-gathering model that will allow State library agencies to standardize data collection practices for the Nation's public libraries.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

- o During FY 1985, program activities have continued to generate an awareness of library issues. Contractors have made presentations on the projects "New Directions in Library and Information Science Education" and "To Explore Procedures ... in the Accreditation of Programs for Library and Information Science" at three major association conferences. The contractors also have contributed a number of articles to the library press.
- o Alliance for Excellence, the report produced under the "Libraries and the Learning Society" project funded in FY 1983 and 1984, was on agendas of 16 national and State association conferences.

Program Effectiveness: No data are available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Studies : Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. The program was extended 1 year under GEPA.
2. Authorization for HEA Title II-B, Sections 222, 223, and 224.
3. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

STRENGTHENING RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES--
DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO MAJOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES
(CFDA No. 84.091)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II C, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Section 201, and by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 1021) (expires September 30, 1986) 1/

Funding Since 1981

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 2/
1981	$10,000,000	$6,000,000
1982	6,000,000	5,760,000
1983	6,000,000	6,000,000
1984	6,000,000	6,000,000
1985	15,000,000	6,000,000

Purpose: To promote high-quality research and education throughout the United States by providing grants to help major research libraries to (1) maintain and strengthen their collections and (2) make their holdings available to other libraries and to individual researchers and scholars outside their primary clientele.

Eligibility: Major research libraries are eligible to apply for program funding. Major research libraries may be public or private nonprofit institutions; institutions of higher education; independent research libraries; and State or public libraries. They must demonstrate that they have collections that contribute significantly to higher education and research, are broadly based, are recognized as having national or international significance for scholarly research, and contain material not widely available but in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with the applicant institution.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To increase access to research materials;
- To preserve unique materials;
- To help research libraries acquire distinctive, unique, and specialized materials;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- To promote cooperative activity among institutions; and
- To extend benefits to as many institutions as possible, including previously unfunded institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Nine new grantees were among the 43 primary grantees funded in FY 1985; counting institutions benefiting under cooperative projects, 45 research libraries were supported.
- Twenty-eight of the 43 grantees chose bibliographic control as the principal area of project activity; they added new entries to national data bases, thus making additional research materials accessible.
- Twenty-one grantees used Title II-C funds for advanced preservation techniques to make rare and unique materials more available.
- Four grantees acquired specialized materials and entered the bibliographic records into national data bases, making additional unique materials accessible and available to researchers and scholars.
- Three institutions promoted cooperative activities by participating in a joint project.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The FY 1985 appropriation of $6 million supported 43 grants. The size of the grants ranged from $55,293 to $256,500, with an average of $139,535. All geographic areas of the country were represented. The distribution of grants by type of institution was as follows:

Libraries at institutions of higher education	33
Independent research libraries	2
Public libraries	3
Museums	3
Historical societies	2

Program Effectiveness: No information on program effectiveness is available. Information on major activities includes the following:

- Implementation of national bibliographic network. Systematic sharing of bibliographic data facilitates access to rare materials and, by eliminating duplicative efforts in cataloguing and indexing, saves thousands of hours. In FY 1985, 70.6 percent of the total funds awarded ($4,236,695) were used for bibliographic control.
- Physical preservation of rare materials. Poor physical condition limits access and use of rare materials, and progressive deterioration may eventually result in the total loss of fragile, rare materials. Increasing awareness of the importance of preservation to the research community caused many preservation projects to be submitted; 28.8 percent ($1,729,997) of the total funds were awarded to 21 projects for various kinds of preservation activities.

- Development of specialized collections. Centralized collections of rare or specialized materials facilitate research. In FY 1985, four grantees chose to intensify collection development by adding books, manuscripts, microfilm, journals, and maps on such diverse subject areas as Canadian studies, mathematics, agriculture, and Japanese poetry, accounting for the remaining 0.6 percent($33,308) of the funds.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Studies : Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. Program was extended 1 year under GEPA through FY 1986.
2. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES
(CFDA No. 84.154)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title II, P.L. 91-600, as amended by the LSCA Admendments of 1984, P.L. 98-480 (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1983	$50,000,000	$50,000,000 2/
1984	0	0
1985	50,000,000	25,000,000 3/4/

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide the Federal share of funds for the construction of new public library buildings and for the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of existing buildings; initial equipment for the constructed buildings; or any combination of the activities included in the LSCA definition of "construction" (including architects' fees and land acquisition).

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for Title II funds; Also eligible are the agencies in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department had two principal objectives for this program:

- To complete the funding of public library construction projects that were supported by the Emergency Jobs Act and designed to create jobs for unemployed workers in areas of high unemployment; and
- To provide strategic technical assistance to State library administrative agencies after a 9-year absence of Federal public library construction funds (1974-82).

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1985, 268 construction projects were funded with more than $15 million in LSCA Title II funds. These Federal funds stimulated more than $73 million in local and State matching funds.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Not surprisingly, an American Library Association survey of public library construction needs for 1981-85 indicated that $2.3 billion was needed for over 2,800 library projects. LSCA II funds enable local communities to reduce this estimated backlog of construction needs. Projects that were funded were new buildings, additions to existing libraries, general remodeling of older buildings and special remodeling for handicapped accessibility, energy conservation, and the housing of computers for library users.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

New regulations were published on August 16, 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. American Library Association. Public Library Construction Needs, 1981-85.

2. LSCA Grant Awards.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No Department of Education studies related to this program are in progress. The American Library Association is conducting a survey of public library construction needs to update its previous study.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program Studies : Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

2. The Emergency Jobs Act, P.L. 98-8, appropriated $50 million in FY 1983 for public library construction to be administered under the authority of the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, program for public library construction. No time limit was put on the expenditure of funds.

3. Under the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for making grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for making grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives). (See Chapter #609.)

4. There is no time limit for the expenditure of construction funds.

LIBRARY SERVICES FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND HAWAIIAN NATIVES--BASIC AND SPECIAL PROJECTS DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES (CFDA No. 84-163)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title IV, P.L. 91-600, as amended by the LSCA Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-480, (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding in FY 1985 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 2/
1985	1.5% of the appropriation for LSCA Titles I, II, and III are set aside for Indian tribes and 0.5% of the appropriations for LSCA Titles I, II, and III are set aside for Hawaiian natives.	$2,360,000 ($1,770,000 for Indian tribes and $590,000 for Hawaiian natives)

Purposes: (1) To promote the extension of public library services to Hawaiian natives and to Indian tribes living on or near reservations; (2) to encourage the establishment and expansion of tribal library programs; and (3) to promote the improvement of administration and implementation of library services for Indian tribes and Hawaiian natives by providing funds to establish new programs and support ongoing programs.

Eligibility: Only federally recognized Indian tribes submitting applications for library projects to serve Indians living on or near a reservation, and organizations primarily serving and representing Hawaiian natives that are recognized by the Governor of Hawaii, are eligible. (For purposes of this program, "Indian tribe" means an Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community certified by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for Federal special programs and services.)

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To award basic grants for one or more of the following purposes: to increase awareness of tribal library needs; to train or pay the salaries of tribal library personnel; to purchase library materials; to support special library programs; to increase access to library services; to construct, renovate, or remodel library buildings; and

- To award special project grants that will enhance and supplement the purposes just listed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- **Basic Grants:** The majority of the 131 tribes and villages that received Basic Grants chose to purchase library materials and to pay the salaries of tribal library personnel. One Basic Grant of $590,000 was made to Hawaiian natives to improve the delivery of outreach services to special populations.

- **Special Project Grants:** Two Special Project grantees plan to build new library facilities. The remaining grantees will pursue activities that include the use of bookmobiles, the building of additions to existing facilities, the training of tribal members as library personnel, and the performance of needs assessments.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The FY 1985 appropriation of $2,360,000 was used to fund 131 Basic Grants to Indian tribes, totaling $457,900; 1 Basic Grant of $590,000 to Hawaiian natives; and 18 Special Project Grants ranging from $3,000 to $310,833.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Studies : Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8307

Notes

1. FY 1985 is the first year of program operation.
2. The Administration requested no funds for this program for FY 1986.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: General Education Provisions Act, Section 405 (20 U.S.C. 1221e) (expires September 30, 1986).[1]

Funding Since 1981 [2], [3]

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	$120,000,000	$65,614,000
1982	130,000,000	53,389,000
1983	145,000,000	55,614,000
1984	160,000,000	48,231,000
1985	175,000,000	51,231,000

Purposes: To help solve or to alleviate the problems of, and to promote the reform and renewal of, American education; to advance the practice of education as an art, science, and profession; to strengthen the scientific and technological foundations of education; and to build an effective educational research and development (R&D) system.

The National Institute of Education (NIE) was established to carry out these policies. NIE, headed by a Director and a Council, was required to concentrate on the following R&D topics:[4]

1. Improving student achievement in basic academic skills, including reading and mathematics;

2. Overcoming problems of educational finance, productivity, and management;

3. Improving the ability of schools to provide equal education opportunities for students with limited English-speaking ability, women, and students who are socially, economically, or educationally disadvantaged;

4. Preparing youths and adults for careers;

5. Overcoming the special problems of nontraditional or older students (including part-time students);

6. Encouraging the study of language and culture, both national and international; and

7. Improving dissemination and use of R&D results.

To accomplish these purposes, NIE was authorized to conduct, assist, and foster educational research; to collect and disseminate research findings; to train persons in educational research; to support, through grants and technical assistance, public and private organizations, institutions, agencies, or individuals that collect data and disseminate research findings and train persons in educational research; to promote the coordination of research activities within the Federal Government; and to construct or provide for facilities to carry out NIE's mission. NIE was required to spend through grant and contracts at least 90 percent of its appropriated funds for R&D.

NIE was directed to conduct R&D and dissemination activities through grants and contracts with regional educational laboratories and R&D centers. These laboratories and centers are required to conduct R&D, prepare long-range R&D plans, disseminate their findings, provide technical assistance, and provide training for minorities and women.

The legislation also directed NIE to carry out the National Assessment of Educational Progress, which assesses the performance of children and young adults in the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and communication.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417 (a)]

A. Objectives

Each NIE program has specific objectives that are described in this section. In addition, all NIE programs have the objective of disseminating research findings and helping practitioners and policymakers put into practice the results of R&D.

R&D Centers:

In FY 1985, NIE identified two objectives for the R&D Centers program. One was the continuation of educational research conducted by the 10 R&D Centers. This was the last year of funding for 9 of the 10 R&D Centers (excluding the School Technology Center). In FY 1986, the Department will replace these 9 Centers with 11 new R&D Centers. The second objective was to conduct a competition for 11 new R&D Center awards.

Regional Educational Laboratories:

In FY 1985, the two main objectives of the Regional Educational Laboratories component of NIE were to continue support for the 9 laboratories currently holding awards and to hold a competition for 8 new awards. Of the previous awardees, only the Midwest Regional Laboratory, which received its award in September 1984, will continue to be supported in FY 1986.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP):

The objective of NAEP is to conduct periodic assessments of the knowledge, skills, understanding, and attitudes of young Americans through cross-sectional national surveys. Six groups of students are included in each assessment: 9-year-olds, 13-year-olds, 17-year-olds, and students in grades 4, 8, and 11. Periodically, NAEP also surveys the performance of out-of-school 17-year olds (early graduates and dropouts) and young adults ages 26 to 35. In addition, NAEP is currently conducting a survey of 21- to 25-year-olds to assess their literacy skills. NAEP assesses performance in reading, mathematics, and writing at least once every 5 years. In addition, other areas such as science, citizenship, literature, music, social science, art, and career and occupational development are assessed periodically. NAEP also conducts special studies on such topics as functional literacy, computer skills, basic life skills, energy, and health.

Educational Resources Information Center:

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is charged to collect, index, abstract, analyze, and disseminate the literature dealing with education. Its products and services include data bases, abstracts, microfiche, computer searches, document reproductions, and analyses and syntheses. Sixteen clearinghouses in the ERIC system focus on particular areas of education such as handicapped and gifted children; adult, career, and vocational education; tests, measurements, and evaluation; science, mathematics, and environment education; counseling and personnel services; social studies/social science education; educational management; elementary and early childhood education; teacher education; rural education and small schools; reading and communication skills; junior colleges; information resources; languages and linguistics; urban education; and higher education.

Other Educational Research Activities:

NIE also supported a variety of other research activities through grants and contracts. Major activities are described in the next section.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The major accomplishments of FY 1985 centered around the four main components of NIE (R&D Centers, Regional Educational Laboratories, NAEP, and ERIC) plus R&D supported through grants and contracts.

R&D Centers:

NIE provided $14.2 million in FY 1985 to continue the activities of 10 existing R&D Centers. The Centers focused their research on the themes of effective schools; teacher quality and effectiveness; educational software and technology; education, employment, and productivity; basic and higher-order skills; and dissemination of research findings and research-based school improvement. The centers participated in two major collaborative activities. A five-center consortium conducted a supplementary survey and analysis of data from the National Center for Education Statistics High School and Beyond survey. Several centers also collaborated to develop a major synthesis of knowledge in the area of education and employment.

NIE also provided $1.5 million dollars to support planning grants and peer reviews for the competition of the R&D Centers and regional educational laboratories. The 11 centers, to be selected in early FY 1986, will operate under 5-year grants with a projected budget totaling $58.5 million. The 11 subjects to be studied are these:

1. Teacher Education
2. Teacher Quality and Effectiveness
3. Student Testing, Evaluation, and Standards
4. Study of Writing
5. Study of Learning
6. Effective Elementary Schools
7. Effective Secondary Schools
8. Education and Employment
9. Postsecondary Management and Governance
10. Postsecondary Teaching and Learning
11. State and Local Policy Development and Leadership in Education

Regional Educational Laboratories:

NIE provided $14.2 million in FY 1985 to continue the activities of the 10 existing regional educational laboratories. One laboratory collaborated with the R&D Centers in the synthesis of knowledge in the area of education and employment.

As already noted, NIE provided planning grants and conducted peer reviews for the competition to select the regional educational laboratories. NIE selected eight applicants to operate the new regional educational laboratories. Joining the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, which won the contract for the Midwest Region in FY 1984, are the following:

Mid-Atlantic Region:	Research for Better Schools
Appalachian Region :	Appalachian Educational Laboratory
Southeastern Region:	Southeastern Regional Council for Education Improvement
Southwestern Region:	Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Central Region :	Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory
Northwestern/ Pacific Basin Regions:	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Northeastern Region:	The Network, Inc.
Western Region :	Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

These nine laboratories are operating under 5-year contracts with an estimated total budget of $85.2 million. Each laboratory will concentrate on the improvement of teaching and learning in public and private schools as well as in nonschool educational settings in its region.

National Assessment of Educational Progress:

NIE provided $5.4 million in FY 1985 to fund the activities of the NAEP program; $1.5 million of this amount was for the Young Adult Literacy Survey. 3/

Steps were taken to extend coverage of adult literacy, higher order skills in math and science, and language-minority students. For example, during the spring of 1985, the Educational Testing Service, which currently is responsible for the development and administration of NAEP, administered the Young Adult Literacy Survey, to develop a profile of the reading, writing, and speaking skills of the Nation's 20 million young adults between the ages of 21 and 25. Final reports from this survey are due in February 1986.

Other activities of NAEP included the completion of a report on trends in reading proficiency of students ages 9, 13, and 17 years between 1971 and 1984. Significant findings from the report are these: (1) Disadvantaged and minority youngsters have substantially improved their reading skills since 1980 and (2) the majority of 17-year-old students are still unable to read well enough to learn what they should from a high school textbook. In addition, NAEP developed plans to collect data on the knowledge of literature and American history during the 1985-86 cycle using funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Other activities during FY 1985 aimed at improving access to and use of NAEP data. NAEP helped States conduct State-level assessments. In the case of three southern states and the Southern Regional Educational Board, NIE supported joint State efforts at assessment. In addition, NAEP began working with the Assessment Policy Unit in England to develop an international assessment component.

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC):

NIE provided $5.2 million in FY 1985 to continue the activities of ERIC. ERIC resources were accessible through some 3,000 libraries, information centers, clearinghouses, and special programs. ERIC resources, including online searches and microfiche, were used more than 1 million times during FY 1985.

Other Educational Research Activities:

The Center for the Study of Reading collaborated with NIE and the National Academy of Education in supporting the Commission on Reading and publishing its report Becoming a Nation of Readers. This report summarized current knowledge about reading and its implications for improved instruction.

The Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR) opened in June 1985. The Center's primary mission is to continue and expand the bilingual education research formerly conducted by the National Center for Bilingual Research, whose contract ended in 1985.

The Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) continued major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and teacher education. IRT researchers provided technical assistance to nearly 30 school systems; institute staff organized more than 40 workshops; and research results were presented to some 40,000 teachers and administrators, 20,000 educational researchers, and 16,000 teacher educators.

The ECIA Chapter 1 Study funded 10 projects in FY 1985 at a total cost of $3.3 million.

Following an agreement between the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Japanese Minister of Science, Culture, and Education in September, 1984, NIE made several awards in FY 1985 to Japanese and American education experts for data collection and analysis.

NIE developed a program to make available the results of educational research on improving teacher preparation programs. NIE plans to fund 20 to 30 development-demonstration projects in which schools of education, school districts, and other partners would use research to change the methods of teacher instruction.

C. Costs and Benefits

R&D Centers and Regional Educational Laboratories:

The centers and laboratories have been the focus of several studies designed to assess and evaluate their operations and products (see Section E). In FY 1983, NIE (through the National Council on Educational Research) funded a study to examine the activities of the labs and centers and their perceived impact. Here are some of the conclusions from that report (E.10):

1. The R&D products of the laboratories and centers have focused on improving teacher preparation; the instructional process; and school curriculums such as mathematics, English, science, and foreign languages. These areas are consistent with the recommendations made by the 1983 national educational reform studies (e.g., A Nation at Risk).

2. The labs and centers appear to work in substantially the same educational content areas; there is little evidence that they are carrying out distinct missions.

3. The Federal Government should continue to support the labs and centers.

4. Research findings are not being effectively disseminated to practitioners, policymakers, and parents at the local school level.

5. The labs and centers often fail to get the users of R&D products involved in the identification and development of projects; as a result, the products are less likely to be used than would otherwise be the case.

NIE used the conclusions from this and other studies to shape the competition described earlier in Section B. NIE also set new and more rigorous requirements for reviewing and evaluating the activities of the R&D Centers and laboratories and for monitoring awards by NIE.

National Assessment of Educational Progress:

The most recent assessment of NAEP, Measuring the Quality of Education, by William Wirtz and Archie Lapointe (E. 14), sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, and Spencer Foundation, recommended that the essential activities of NAEP be maintained as vital factors in implementing an educational standards policy. The report also recommended a number of measures to improve NAEP's timeliness, comprehensiveness, and utility.

Educational Resources Information Center:

In 1981, NIE released a report in which the cost and use of the ERIC system were examined (E.5). Findings from this study indicate that more than 200,000 online and batch searches are conducted per year and that approximately 800,000 requests for ERIC documents are made per year. Average costs for use of the different components of ERIC, including user costs vary: for Resources in Education, $46.30; Current Index to Journals in Education, $42.50; and computer search, $78.00.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Secretary's reorganization of the Department's research, statistics, and educational improvement activities was approved on October 1, 1985. The three components of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)--i.e., National Center for Education Statistics, National Institute of Education, and Center for Libraries and Education Improvement-have been replaced by five program units: Office of Research, Center for Statistics, Programs for the Improvement of Practice, Information Services, and Library Programs. The four main components of the NIE program that have been described in this chapter are now located as follows:

R&D Centers..............................	Office of Research
Regional Educational Laboratories....	Programs for the Improvement of Practice
National Assessment of Educational Progress................................	Center for Statistics
Educational Resources Information Center................	Information Services

The Secretary issued seven principles to guide the development of future activities of the NAEP program:

1. Data collection to facilitate comparisons over time and with other countries,
2. State participation in NAEP (perhaps through a cost-sharing arrangement with the Department),
3. Regular inclusion of out-of-school 17-year-olds in NAEP assessments,
4. Development of an index of functional literacy,
5. Tests to assess basic knowledge in core academic subjects,
6. Coordination of NAEP with other data collection efforts in the Department, and
7. Faster analysis and dissemination of NAEP data.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Clay, K. "ERIC: How It Has Improved." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1982, pp. 198-200.

2. Finn, C. E., Jr. "What the NIE Cannot Be." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1983, pp. 407-410.

3. Florio, D. H. "Curing America's Quick Fix Mentality: A Role for Federally Supported Educational Research." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1983, pp. 411-415.

4. Fry, B. M. Evaluation Study of ERIC Products and Services. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1972.

5. Heinmiller, J. L. A Descriptive Summary: ERIC Cost and Usage Study. Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1981.

6. Louis, K.S. et al. Preliminary Findings for the Study of the R&D: Utilization Program. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1980.

7. National Academy of Sciences. Fundamental Research and the Process of Education: A Report to the National Institute of Education by the National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C.: NAS, 1977.

8. National Council on Educational Research. Annual Report (six reports, 1974-82).

9. Panel for the Review of Laboratory and Center Operations. Research and Development Centers and Regional Education Laboratories: Strengthening and Stabilizing A National Resource. NIE, 1979.

10. Price, K. O. Creating and Disseminating Knowledge for Educational Reform: Policy Management of the National Institute of Education's Regional Educational Laboratories and National Research and Development Centers (Los Angeles, Calif.: Center for Leadership Development, 1984).

11. Thompson, C. L. "Dissemination at the National Institute of Education: Contending Ideas about Research, Practice, and the Federal Role." (Vol. VI of A Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement) Andover, Mass: The NETWORK, Inc. 1982.

12. U.S. Department of Education, The National Research and Development Centers: A Service Delivery Assessment. Washington, D.C.: ED, 1983.

13. U.S. Department of Education. Regional Education Laboratories: A Service Delivery Assessment. Washington, D.C.: ED, 1982.

14. Wirtz, W., and A. Lapointe. Measuring the Quality of Education: A Report on Assessing Education Progress. Washington, D.C.: Wirtz and Lapointe, 1982.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the R&D Centers, Regional Education Laboratories, National Assessment of Educational Progress, or Educational Resources Information Center are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:
R&D Centers, Tom Carroll
(202) 254-7180

Regional Educational Laboratories, David Mack
(202) 254-5654

National Assessment of Educational Progress, Larry Rudner
(202) 254-6271

Educational Resources Information Center, Alan Moorehead
(202) 254-5500

Program Studies: Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. The authorizing legislation expired at the end of FY 1985. A 1-year extension was authorized by Section 414 of the General Education Provisions Act. The Secretary abolished NIE through his reorganization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, which was approved on October 1, 1985.

2. Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, NIE's funded ceiling was limited to $55.6 million in each fiscal year from 1982 through 1984.

3. Section 405(k) of GEPA established a separate authority for the National Assessment of Educational Progress within NIE. The Education Amendments of 1984 reauthorized NAEP through FY 1989, providing $8 million in FY 1985 and $10.8 million for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. Approximately $4 million was spent for NAEP in each of the fiscal years from 1981 through 1984 and $5.3 million for FY 1985. Although NAEP was provided with a separate authorization, legislative action was not taken to provide funds for NAEP. In FY 1985, NIE supported NAEP from funds appropriated for NIE as a whole.

4. The legislation established a National Council on Educational Research (NCER), consisting of 15 presidentially appointed members who serve 3-year staggered terms. Under the new Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) structure, the NCER no longer has the authority to establish policy but, instead, functions as an advisory body. Its purview includes all of OERI.

SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM--DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
(CFDA Nos. 84.122, 84.073, and 84.123)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, Section 583(a) as amended, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	1/	$28,765,000
1984	1/	28,765,000
1985	1/	31,909,000

Purpose: To assess the needs and to gather and disseminate information on the effectiveness of programs to meet the needs of persons served by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA); to support research and demonstrations related to the purposes of the ECIA; to improve educational personnel training; and to help State and local educators implement ECIA.

The Secretary's Discretionary Program assisted programs in four categories: (1) programs mandated by the authorizing statute (Arts in Education, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, and Inexpensive Book Distribution) 2/, (2) those mandated by amendments under P.L. 98-312 (Law-Related Education) 2/, (3) those cited in the budget request or in House or Senate committee reports (National Diffusion Network and evaluation of the ECIA Chapter 1 Block Grant), and (4) special initiatives undertaken by the Department.

Category 1: Programs mandated by the ECIA

These programs are described individually in the Annual Evaluation Report: "Arts in Education" in Chapter 117, "Inexpensive Book Distribution" in Chapter 118, and "Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education" in Chapter 114.

Category 2: Program mandated by P.L. 98-312

This program is described in the Annual Evaluation Report: "Law-Related Education" in Chapter 119.

Category 3: Programs cited by House or Senate Committee reports in response to the Administration's budget request

Under the National Diffusion Network (NDN), organizations that have developed products or practices certified by the Department's Joint Dissemination

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Review Panel and have NDN grants disseminate information about those efforts and provide training to educational personnel at new sites throughout the Nation as Developer Demonstrators. Agencies help local educators install the certified products or practices through support from State Facilitator grants. Both types of grants are awarded competitively and may last as long as 4 years, depending on performance and availability of funds. Contracts are also awarded competitively and for varying lengths of time for organizations to provide technical assistance to NDN grantees and to identify and assess promising practices. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $10.7 million for NDN in FY 1985. 3/

As for the evaluation of the ECIA Chapter I Program, the Secretary's Discretionary Fund provided $1,550,000 for this purpose in FY 1985. (See Chapter 101 of this report).

Category 4: The Secretary's Special Initiatives

Special initiatives in FY 1985 included a grant competition to fund research, demonstrations, and planning projects in two priority areas: teacher incentives and field-initiated projects in the areas of content, character, and choice. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided approximately $3.3 million for these projects in FY 1985: $503,000 for teacher incentive projects and $2.8 million for field-initiated projects. 4/ In addition, the Secretary's Discretionary Program provided about $1.2 million to continue the second and final year of 12 school-based educational technology demonstration projects. 5/

Table I displays the intended distribution of the Secretary's Discretionary Program funds for FY 1985.

Table 1

INTENDED DISTRIBUTION OF THE SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FUNDS, FY 1985

Programs Mandated by the ECIA (Total)	$13,157,000
Arts in Education	3,157,000
Inexpensive Book Distribution	7,000,000
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education	3,000,000
Newly Mandated by P.L. 98-312 (Total)	$ 2,000,000
Law-related Education	2,000,000
Congressional Responses to Departmental Budget Requests (Total)	$12,250,000
Programs cited in House or Senate Committee reports:	
National Diffusion Network	10,700,000
Evaluation of Chapter 1	1,550,000
(4) Secretary's Special Initiatives (Total)	$4,502,000
Teacher Incentives	503,000
Field-initiated Studies	2,584,000
Educational Technology	1,200,000
Secretary's School Recognition Program/Other	215,000
Total Appropriation	$31,909,000

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

o Through the National Diffusion Network

--To disseminate more information in the Secretary's priority areas, especially in mathematics, science, adult literacy, teacher preservice and inservice training, and technology applications;

--To increase the number, quality, and geographic spread of adoptions of exemplary efforts; and

--To provide technical assistance.

- Through the Secretary's Special Initiatives

  --To stimulate the development of teacher incentives designed to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education by influencing teacher recruitment and personnel systems;

  --To stimulate field-initiated projects involving the content of students' education, ways in which schools can develop positive character traits among students, and means to expand parents' choice in education for their children; and

  --To demonstrate in local school settings the effective use of technology to improve teaching and learning in reading, writing, science, and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1984, the Secretary's Discretionary Program funds were frozen by the U.S. District Court in *United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago*. The Discretionary Program's FY 1985 funds have been used to support the FY 1984 projects. When FY 1984 funds are released by the District Court, accounting adjustments will be made so that FY 1985 grants can be awarded.

In FY 1985, the progress and accomplishments of each of the program's components were as follows:

National Diffusion Network:

- The National Diffusion Network continued support of 82 Developer-Demonstrator grants and 53 State Facilitator grants and supported 15 new Developer-Demonstrator grants in priority areas that included mathematics, science, teacher training, adult literacy, reading, and writing; identified 10 new promising practices in different program areas; and prepared the submission packages for these 10 new practices for review by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

Secretary's Special Initiatives:

- Twenty-five geographically dispersed applicants were selected to receive planning grants for developing a variety of teacher incentive plans to be implemented in their local school districts and to serve as models for others throughout the Nation. The grants totaled approximately $500,000. 6/

- Thirty-four field-initiated grants were awarded for projects of national significance to improve elementary and secondary education. These projects were designed to improve the content of textbooks and instructional materials, to foster student character development, and to enhance parental choice in education. In addition, other projects were supported to expand business and education partnerships, to develop school-community relationships, to design drug abuse materials for the elementary school grades, to study mathematically precocious youths, and to examine practices of nuclear energy education across the U.S.

- The second and final year of 12 school-based technology demonstration projects was funded. The projects were initially funded under a grant competition to demonstrate uses of technology for the improvement of core academic skills, ranging from writing to physics.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope:

Under the National Diffusion Network, costs are roughly $770 per school or about $7.15 per student served. On the basis of figures compiled from FY 1985 project applications, program staff reported that 13,000 schools were adopting and implementing exemplary projects. Approximately 45,000 educators received training to use programs and practices, and 1.3 million students (3 percent of fall 1983 elementary/secondary enrollment) were being served by programs adopted in these new sites. 7/

- Under the Secretary's Special Initiatives, FY 1985 awards ranged from about $16,000 to $150,000, with the exception of a $250,000 award to the Chicago Public Schools. The projects that began during the 1983-84 school year are being completed and final reports are now being received.
- Moving into their second year of funding, 12 school-based technology demonstration projects applied a variety of new technologies to improve teaching and learning in reading, writing, science, and mathematics. Several are considered good candidates for dissemination as exemplary by the National Diffusion Network.

Program Effectiveness:

National Diffusion Network:

No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

Secretary's Special Initiatives

The overall effectiveness of these varied efforts can best be demonstrated by the information and satisfaction these programs generated at each specific site. These efforts range from the parental education choice program in New York, which established an open enrollment system, to the development of teacher incentive plans and evaluation models that have been disseminated and shared with others across the Nation, the development of computer-assisted school board training materials, and the establishment of a private school recognition program. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided the opportunity for these grantees to expand upon ideas and develop model programs for the improvement of education.

The school-based technology demonstration projects are providing insights into the potential contribution of technology to (1) revitalizing the elementary and secondary curriculum, (2) developing higher-order thinking skills, and (3) extending the availability of quality education programs to a much larger number of students, particularly in rural areas.

D. Highlights of Activities

New NDN program regulations require educational programs to be reviewed by the Department's Joint Dissemination Review Panel for evidence of effectiveness every 4 years.

In order to award grants early enough for planning and implementation of demonstrations during the coming school year, notices about grant competitions supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Program will be published earlier in the year.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies about programs supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:

Secretary's Discretionary Program:	James V. Capua, (202) 254-8227
National Diffusion Network:	Jean Narayanan, (202) 653-7003
Program Studies:	Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Section 583 of ECIA authorized up to 6 percent of the funds appropriated for Chapter 2 of the ECIA to be used for the Secretary's Discretionary Program.

2. Programs mandated by law in the Secretary's Discretionary Program are covered by separate chapters in the Annual Evaluation Report.

3. Because of the impoundment of funds by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, FY 1985 funds ($2,382,231) were used to complete the 1984 grants cycle. The litigation has also caused 1985 awardees to receive only a portion of the total awards.

4. A small portion of these funds was used to support the Secondary School Recognition Program and other activities.

5. To date, $885,840 of the $1,203,747 has been awarded for year two, with the balance of $317,634 awaiting the Federal court's decision. In fiscal years 1982 through 1984, the Discretionary Fund was used to support the development of children's educational television programs. In FY 1985, the new Science and Mathematics Discretionary Fund is being used for this purpose instead of the Discretionary Fund.

6. Because of the impoundment of funds in the Chicago court case, only five of these applicants have been funded. The remaining 20 applicants will be funded as soon as the funds are released.

7. Funding delays (due to the impoundment of funds in the Chicago court case) have created problems such as late awards and sporadic funding for the National Diffusion Network program. The funding delays have also affected the collection and dissemination of information on program adoptions, teacher training, and impact on students.

SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FOR MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, COMPUTER LEARNING, AND CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGES

(CFDA No. 84.168)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act (EESA) of 1984, Section 212, Title II, P.L. 98-377 (20 U.S.C. 3972) (expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$40,000,000[1]	$9,900,000[2]

Purpose: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teaching, computer literacy, and instruction in critical foreign languages.

The Secretary's Discretionary Program provides assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations for projects in mathematics and science instruction, computer learning, and instruction in critical foreign languages. The legislation mandated set-asides as follows:

- **Critical Foreign Languages:** Twenty-five percent is reserved for projects at institutions of higher education to improve and expand instruction in critical foreign languages.
- **Evaluation and Research:** Up to $3 million is reserved for evaluation and research activities to be conducted by the Department of Education.

The remaining monies are available for grant awards for projects of national significance in mathematics and science instruction, computer learning, and foreign language instruction in critical languages and for other appropriate activities (e.g., educational television) that come under the broad mandate of improving the quality of teaching in the subjects of concern.

The planned allocation for the Secretary's Discretionary Program for mathematics, science, computer learning, and critical foreign languages in FY 1985 was as follows:

Critical Foreign Languages	$2,475,000
Evaluation and Research	1,000,000
Other Discretionary Activities	
Grant Competition	3,425,000
Educational Television	3,000,000
3-2-1 Contact!	1,000,000
Voyage of the "Mimi"	1,000,000
Children's Television Workshop Mathematics Series	1,000,000
Total	$9,900,000

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1985, the Department's principal objectives for this program, by category, were as follows:

Critical Foreign Languages:

To make awards to institutions of higher education for the improvement and expansion of instruction in critical foreign languages. 3/ Projects to improve instruction include those designed--

- To provide short- or long-term advanced training to foreign-language instructors;
- To provide training in new teaching methods and proficiency evaluation techniques; and
- To improve teaching methods through curriculum development, including the use of technologies.

Projects to expand instruction include those designed--

- To add to the curriculum languages not currently offered;

- To add to the curriculum advanced language courses;
- To devise instructional approaches suited to diverse student populations; and
- To use technology to increase access to instruction in critical foreign languages.

Evaluation and Research Set-aside:

To conduct research on improving teacher training, retraining, inservice training, and retention in the fields of mathematics and science; and

To conduct evaluations of the programs assisted under Title II and to conduct policy analyses of alternative methods to improve instruction in mathematics and science.

Other Discretionary Activities:

Math/Science Grant Competition

To make grant awards to SEAs and LEAs, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations for projects of national significance in mathematics and science instruction, computer learning, and instruction in critical foreign languages. Special consideration is given to the following applicants: 4/

- LEAs, or consortiums thereof, proposing to establish or improve magnet school programs for gifted and talented students; and
- Applicants proposing to provide special services to historically underserved and underrepresented populations in the fields of mathematics and science.

Projects funded under the Secretary's Discretionary Program may include those designed--

- To improve teacher recruitment and retention in the fields of mathematics, science, computer learning, and critical foreign languages;
- To improve teacher qualifications and skills in the fields of mathematics, science, computer learning, and critical foreign languages; and
- To improve curriculums in mathematics, science, computer learning, and critical foreign languages, including the use of new technologies.

Educational Television

To continue to make available high-quality educational television programs in mathematics, science, and technology.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1985, the progress and accomplishments of the program's components were as follows:

Critical Foreign Languages: A grant competition was conducted in the summer of 1985. Thirty-nine awards were made.

Evaluation and Research Set-aside: No projects have been implemented at this time. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement and the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation are currently developing plans to conduct research and evaluation activities.

Other Discretionary Activities:

Math/Science Grant Competition: A grant competition was announced in the summer of 1985. The deadline for submitting applications was October 29, 1985; 472 applications were received. The anticipated award date is Spring, 1986.

Educational Television: Funds were provided to support three educational television programs:

3-2-1 Contact!

Funds were provided to produce the third season of this Children's Television Workshop science and technology series for children 8 to 12 years old. Each series consists of 65 half-hour shows, broadcast each weekday for 13 weeks.

Voyage of the Mimi

Funds were provided to produce the second season of this science and mathematics series designed for grades four through six but applicable through grade eight. This TV series, produced by Bank Street College of Education and Holt, Rinehart and Winston Publishers, emphasizes a discovery approach to math and science by moving from concrete real-world experiences to a more abstract understanding of science and math principles.

Mathematics Series

The Children's Television Workshop has received funding from the Department of Education, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, private foundations, and corporations to produce a new TV series for 8- to 10-year olds on math concepts and problem-solving strategies. The new series will be aired in about a year.

C. Costs and Benefits

No information is available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D. Highlights of Activities

Legislation to authorize Title II of EESA for a 3-year period was signed into law on November 22, 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The legislation of Title II authorized the Secretary to conduct an evaluation of the programs assisted under Title II and to make a policy analysis of alternative methods to improve instruction in math and science. The Office of Plannng, Budget and Evaluation is currently developing plans to conduct these activities.

Contacts for Further Information

Programs Operations: Patricia Alexander, (202) 254-8227

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Title II of the EESA authorizes $400 million for FY 1985, of which 90 percent is to be used for grants to States (with 1 percent reserved for the U.S. Territories and for school programs administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs) and 10 percent is for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund for programs of national significance.
2. $100 million was appropriated for this new program in FY 1985, of which $89.9 million is for grants to States and $9.9 million is for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund.
3. The list of critical languages was published on August 2, 1985, in the Federal Register (50 FR 31412).
4. In addition to establishing these priorities, the Secretary may select as a priority one or more of the projects listed under the Critical Foreign Languages Set-aside.

EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.171)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Excellence in Education Act of 1984, Title VI of the Education for Economic Security Act, P.L. 98-377 (20 U.S.C. 4031 et seq.) (expires October 1, 1988). 1/

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$16,000,000	$5,000,000 2/

Purpose: To provide grant assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) for individual public schools that are implementing the recommendations of the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, or otherwise striving to improve the quality of elementary or secondary education.

The legislation authorizes a grant program to LEAs to carry out projects of excellence in individual public schools through activities that (1) demonstrate successful techniques for improving the quality of education, (2) can be disseminated and replicated, and (3) are conducted with the participation of principals, teachers, parents, and business concerns in the community.

Two types of awards are made under this program: school excellence grants and special school grants. Both types of awards support school improvement activities, but special school grants require the assurance of financial contributions from the private sector for the proposed activities.

FY 1985 funding priorities for the school excellence grants and special school grants were as follows:

1. Modernization and improvement of secondary school curricula to improve student achievement in academic or vocational subjects and competency in basic functional skills;

2. Elimination of excessive electives and the establishment of increased graduation requirements in basic subjects;

3. Improvement in student attendance and discipline through the demonstration of innovative student motivation techniques and attendance policies with clear sanctions to reduce student absenteeism and tardiness;

4. Demonstrations to increase learning time for students;

5. Experimentation providing incentives to teachers and teams of teachers for outstanding performance;

6. Demonstrations to increase student motivation and achievement through creative combinations of independent study, team teaching, laboratory experience, technology utilization, and improved career guidance and counseling; or

7. Demonstrations of new and promising models of school-community and school-to-school relationships including the use of nonschool personnel to alleviate shortages in areas such as mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction, as well as other partnerships between business and education, including the use of equipment.

In addressing one or more of these priorities, the Secretary especially encouraged proposals that increased parental involvement in improving the quality of elementary and secondary education, and students' knowledge of the early history of the American republic, the significance of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, and other primary documents; and the origins and development of the American form of government and political institutions.

II. FY 1985 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The objective of the Excellence in Education Program is to provide grant assistance for individual public schools across the country that are implementing the recommendations of the NCEE or otherwise striving to improve the quality of elementary or secondary education. Under the program, schools will be selected not on the basis of their performance but on the basis of proposals that have the highest potential for successfully demonstrating techniques to improve the quality of education and that can be disseminated and replicated.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Grant awards will be made in spring 1986. Submission of grant applications was due by October 30, 1985; 825 applications were submitted. No plans have been implemented to conduct research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

C. Costs and Benefits

No information is available on this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Administration requested that FY 1985 funds be rescinded and no funds were requested for the program in FY 1986. The Administration believes that the Secondary School Recognition Program is a better vehicle to recognize and reward excellence in education.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Patricia Alexander, (202) 254-8227.

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877.

Notes

1. Legislation extending this authorization for 3 years was signed into law on November 22, 1985.

2. The Congress appropriated $5 million to implement this program for the 1985-86 school year. Of this amount, $1 million is available for school excellence grants, and $3 million is available for the special school grants. The remaining $1 million is reserved for research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

APPENDIX

EVALUATION CONTRACTS ACTIVE IN OPBE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1985

Summary of Planning & Evaluation Contracts During 385 Printed: 05-Feb-86

FY	Funding Amount	Description of Contract	Contractor & Contract No.	Start Date	End Date	OPBE Project Officer
STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS DIVISION						
84	$1,005,000	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 2, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Advanced Technology, Inc. Indianapolis, Indiana 300-82-0375	01-Oct-84	30-Sep-85	English
84	$2,010,000	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Regions 1 and 3, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey 300-82-0376	01-Oct-84	30-Sep-85	English
84	$1,156,000	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 4, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Northwest Regional Laboratory Portland, Oregon 300-82-0377	01-Oct-84	30-Sep-85	Anderson-Ng
83 84	$567,725 463,656	A study to develop a comprehensive base of information about nationwide operation of Chapter 2, ECIA, in local education agencies regarding program effects and administrative systems.	SRI International Menlo Park, California 300-83-0286	12-Dec-83	12-Dec-85	Chelemer
84	$334,131	Task order contract to carry out analytical studies to provide background information for work of OPBE staff.	Advanced Technology, Inc. Reston, Virginia 300-82-0380	30-Sep-84	30-Sep-85	Anderson-Ng
83 84	$1,514,000 2,619,352	A national longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of services for language-minority, limited-English-proficient students.	Development Associates, Inc. Arlington, Virginia 300-83-0030	01-Dec-82	30-Dec-86	Shuler
85	$438,591	Addition of limited-English-speaking Native American students to the national longitudinal evaluation.	Development Associates, Inc. Arlington, Virginia 300-85-0175	17-Sep-85	16-Dec-86	Shuler

84 85	$263 10,000	Assessment of Chapter 1, ECIA, grant program for the handicappped: who are served and in what settings in high- and low-use States.	Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc. Chapel Hill, North Carolina 300-84-0225	01-Oct-84	31-Dec-85	Maxwell
85	$124,551	Development, field test, and refinement of procedures and materials for evaluating the impact on achievement of LEA projects funded under Title VII, ESEA (Bilingual Education).	SRA Technologies, Inc. Mountain View, California 300-85-0140	08-Jul-85	08-Jan-88	English
85	$160,000	A study to document the processes and procedures that nine States will develop to implement the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.	E. H. White Washington, D. C. 300-85-0166	23-Aug-85	22-Aug-86	Shuler
85	$261,827	Task order contract to provide support services including data collection, data analysis, and analysis of information pertinent to Departmental policy issues.	Advanced Technology, Inc. McLean, Virginia 300-82-0380	01-Oct-82	30-Sep-85	Anderson-Ng
84 85	$534,000 81,000	A study of recent trends in the Vocational Rehabilitation Program's caseloads and placement patterns.	Ecosometrics, Inc. Bethesda, Maryland 300-84-0250	01-Sep-84	30-Jan-87	Kirschenbaum
85	$438,795	Analysis of rehabilitation services in the proprietary sector: a study to identify and analyze factors contributing to the rapid growth of private sector rehabilitation services.	Berkeley Planning Associates Berkeley, California 300-85-0141	01-Jul-85	30-Jun-87	Kirschenbaum

STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION

84 85	$138,650 209,715	Purchase of proprietary data on freshmen college students for Higher Education Research Survey on fall enrollments. Financial aid, attitudinal, economic and demographic information obtained from sample of 250-300,000 students.	HERI, UCLA Los Angeles, California 300-84-0163	29-Jun-84	01-Apr-87	Bert
84 85	$130,000 140,000	The Higher Education Panel each year provides the Department with two policy-relevant, quick response surveys from a sample of institutions of higher education.	American Council on Education Washington, D. C. (Funds transfer to NSF)	01-Oct-82	30-Sep-86	Corrrallo

85	$[illegible]0	Technical support for planning and analysis of postsecondary programs, to provide the Department with secondary data collection and quick response analytical capability for policy and budgetary analysis and program planning.	Appl[illegible] ystems Institute, Inc. Washington, D. C. 300-83-0160	01-Apr-83	31-Mar-86	Morrissey

QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIVISION

85	$340,631	The Education Analysis Center analyzes and synthesizes findings of pertinent past and current research and evaluation studies; analyzes existing relevant and complex data bases; develops models; conducts case studies; and performs literature searches and reviews.	Pelavin Associates, Inc. Washington, D. C. 300-82-0248	01-Oct-82	30-Sep-85	Takai
84	$120,000	Competitive incentives in public education: a contract to educate citizens and policy makers regarding the issues involved in the use of competition and performance incentives in public schools; and to provide assistance to legislators, school administrators, and teachers in preparing materials to assess performance incentive models.	Sequoia Institute Sacramento, California 300-83-0148	12-May-83	13-May-85	Bartell

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIVISION

85	$500,000	Data analysis and technical support, to provide on-call processing and education analysis capability. The major tasks involve compiling data bases and performing data analysis or simulations, organizing and displaying information for use by the Department, and producing technical papers and reports.	Decision Resources Corporation Washington, D. C. 300-83-0211	01-Jul-83	31-Dec-85	de Kanter
83 84 85	$800,000 500,000 725,000	Description and longitudinal survey of immersion programs for bilingual students.	SRA Technologies Mountain View, California 300-83-250	01-Oct-83	30-Sep-88	Baker
84	$82,157	Retrospective analysis of DISTAR for bilingual students.	University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon 300-84-0263	30-Sep-84	30-Sep-85	Baker

84 85	$3[illegible]2 [illegible]4	Evaluation of Indian-controlled schools. A mandated study which examined student costs, achievement, attendance and attrition in schools serving the 8th or 12th grades.	Abt A[illegible]ates, Inc. Cambr[illegible], Massachusetts 300-84-0264	30-Sep-84	31-Dec-85	Berne
84	$40,000	Examination of the state of the art of methods used to identify students for eligibility for bilingual education programs.	Pelavin Associates Washington, D. C. 300-84-0268	30-Sep-84	30-Sep-85	Baker
85	$500,000	A survey of the attitudes and educational preferences of parents of several groups of language minority children. Sample will be linked into NAEP so that parental attitudes can be related to educational progress.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey 300-85-0208	30-Sep-85	30-Dec-86	Baker

COORDINATION STAFF

84	$170,920	Analysis of the theoretical and public policy roots of benefit/cost analysis in rehabilitation; examination of supplements to the R-300/911 data base; proposals to develop practical plans, based on existing data, for models of benefit/cost analysis.	Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 300-84-0259	25-Sep-84	30-Sep-85	Spitzer

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Note: All three-digit numbers are chapter references. These numbers appear in the upper-right hand corner of each page of the report.

Academic Facilities, 523, 524
Adult Education:
  Indian Education, 113
  State Administered Program, 407
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, 114
American Indians, see Indian Education
Arts in Education Program, 117

Basic Educational Opportunity (Pell) Grants, 501
Bilingual Education:
  Academic Excellence, 201
  Developmental, 201
  Evaluation Assistance Centers, 204
  Family English Literacy, 201
  Fellowships, 203
  Immigrant Education, 205
  National Clearinghouse, 204
  Multifunctional Resource Centers, 204
  Program for the Development of Instructional Materials, 201
  Research and Development Program, 204
  Schools of Education Projects, 203
  Special Alternative Instruction, 201
  Special Populations Program, 201
  State Education Agency Programs, 204
  Support Services, 204
  Training Projects, 203
  Transition Program for Refugee Children, 202
  Vocational Training, 406
  Vocational Instructor Training, 406
  Vocational Instructional Materials, 406
Block Grant (Elementary and Secondary Education), 104
Business and International Education (Language Training, Area Studies), 520

Captioned Film Loan Program (Media Services), 312
Centers for Independent Living, 333
Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services, 106
Close Up Foundation (Ellender Fellowships), 110
College Housing Loans, 522, 523, 524
College Library Resources, 604
College Work-Study, 506
College Cooperative Education, 521
Consolidation of Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education, 104
Construction, Schools (in federally affected areas), 109
Consumer and Homemaker Education, 402, 403
Cooperative Education, 521

Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 331
Delinquent Children, 103
Desegregation Assistance, 104, 106
  On the Basis of Sex, 106, 115
  On the Basis of National Origin, 106
  On the Basis of Race, 106
Direct Loan Program, 505
Disadvantaged Students:
  Children in State-Administered Institutions, 103
  Education for, 101, 107, 110
  Legal Training for, 517
  Postsecondary Education, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 517, 605
  Special Services for, 510
  Vocational Education Programs for, 402, 404
Disaster Aid, 108
Dissemination of Exemplary Educational Practices, 611
Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad, (Fulbright-Hays), 519

Early Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 114, 117, 118, 119
Education for the Disadvantaged, 101, 102, 103, 107, 110, 201, 202, 205, 402, 404, 501, 502, 503, 505, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 517, 518, 605
Educational Opportunity Centers, 509
Educational Television and Technology, 611
Elementary and Secondary Education Block Grant, 104
Ellender Fellowships, 110
Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111

Faculty Research Abroad (Fulbright-Hays), 519
Fellowships:
  Bilingual Teachers, 203
  Foreign Language and Area Studies, 520
  Graduate and Professional Study, 518, 519, 520
  Indian Students, 112
Film, Captioned (Media Services), 312
Follow Through, 107
Foreign Language and Area Studies, 519, 520
Fulbright-Hays Grants, 519
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 512

General Assistance to the Virgin Islands, 105
Graduate and Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519, 520
Guaranteed Student Loans, 504

350

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Handicapped Children, Early or Preschool Education for, 302, 303, 306
Handicapped:
  Arts in Education, 117
  Client Assistance Program, 326
  Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 331
  Higher Education for, 308, 510
  Independent Living, 333
  Indians, 334
  Media and Films for, 312
  Migrants, 330
  National Institute of Handicapped Research, 324
  Personnel Training and Recruitment for Education of, 309, 310, 327
  Postsecondary, 308
  Preschool, 302, 303, 306
  Recreation, 329
  Regional Resource Centers, 304
  Research, Demonstration, 306, 307, 311, 313, 314, 324, 328
  Secondary, 314
  Services to, 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 314, 328, 329, 330, 331,
    332, 333, 334
  Severely Handicapped, 307, 328
  Special Studies, 313
  State Aid Grants, 302
  State-Supported School Programs, State Grant Program, 301
  Transitional Services, 314
  Vocational Rehabilitation for, 314, 325, 328, 330, 332, 334, 401
Hawaiian Natives, Vocational Education for, 405
Helen Keller National Center, 331
High School Equivalency Program, Migrant Education, 116
Higher Education:
  Cooperative Education, 521
  Developing Institutions, 512, 514, 515
  Direct Grants, 501, 502
  Direct Loans, 505
  for the Deaf, 308
  for the Disadvantaged, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 509, 510, 514, 515, 517, 605
  for the Handicapped, 308, 510
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Migrant Students, 116
  for Veterans, 511
  for Vocational Students, 401
  for Women, 518, 605
  Guaranteed Student Loans, 504
  Housing, Loans, 522, 523, 524
  Improvement, 512
  Institutional Aid, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 604
  Law, 516, 517
  Postgraduate, 518, 519, 520
  Special Staff Training, 513
  State Student Incentive Grants, 503
  Supplemental Grants, 502
  Talent Search, 508
  Work-Study, 506

Immigrant Education Program, Emergency, 205
Impact Aid, see School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
Incentive Grants to States for Student Assistance, 503
Independent Living, Centers for, 333
Indian Education:
  Adult Indian Education, 113
  Demonstration Projects, 112
  Educational Service Projects, 112
  Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111
  Fellowships for Indian Students, 112
  Personnel Development Projects, 112
  Resource, Evaluation Centers, 112
  Vocational Education for Indian Tribes and Organizations, 405
  Vocational Rehabilitation, 334
Indian Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 111, 112, 113, 518
Inexpensive Book Distribution, 118
Institutions of Higher Education, Payments to 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 604
Interest Subsidy Grants for Academic Facilities Loans, 523
Interlibrary Cooperation, State Grants, 603
International Education and Business Program (Language Training and Area Studies), 520

Language and Areas Studies, 519, 520
Language-Minority or Limited-English-Proficient, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 116, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 406, 510, 602
Law-Related Education, 119, 516, 517
Law School Clinical Experience, 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged, 517
Libraries:
  Career Training, 605
  College Library Resources, 604
  Construction Grants, 608
  for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives, 609
  Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603
  Research and Demonstration, 606
  Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Magnet Schools Assistance, 121
Mathematics and Science State Grants, 120
Media Services and Captioned Film Loan Program, 312
Migrant Education:
  College Assistance Program, 116
  Handicapped, 330
  High School Equivalency Program, 116
  State Formula Grants, 102
Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program, (FIPSE), 512
Minority Institutions, 515
Minority Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 107, 110, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 404, 501, 502, 503, 505, 507, 508, 509, 510, 515, 517, 518, 605

National Diffusion Network, 611
National Institute of Handicapped Research, 324

Pell Grants (formerly BEOGs), 501
Personnel Training, Recruitment for Education of the Handicapped, 309, 310, 327
Postsecondary Education (See Higher Education)
Preschool Education for Handicapped Children, 302, 303, 306
Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519, 520
Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603

Reading Is Fundamental (Inexpensive Book Distribution), 118
Recruitment and Information (Special Education), 310
Refugee Children, 202
Rehabilitation, See Vocational Rehabilitation
Research and Development:
  Handicapped, 306, 308, 311, 313, 314, 331
  Libraries, 606, 607
  Secretary's Special Initiatives, 611
  Vocational Education, 404

Secretary's Discretionary Program, 114, 117, 118, 119, 611
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-School Construction, 109
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-Maintenance and Operations, 108
Science Improvement, 515
Shaughnessy, Mina, Scholars Program (FIPSE), 512
Special Education, Recruitment and Information, 309, 310
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, 510
State Student Incentive Grants, 503
Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Student Assistance, Postsecondary (See Higher Education)
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, 502

Talent Search, 508
Teacher Training:
  Bilingual Education, 203, 204
  Special Education, 309
  Teachers of Secondary Disadvantaged Students, 110
  Territorial Teachers, 601
  Vocational (Bilingual), 203
Technology and Educational Television, 611
Territorial Teacher Training, 601
Training and Recruitment, Handicapped Education, 309, 310
Training, Librarians, 605
Training, Bilingual Education Projects, 204
Training, Rehabilitation Personnel, 327
Training, Special Program Staff, 513

Upward Bound, 507

Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction, 511
Virgin Islands, General Assistance to, 105
Vocational Education:
  Basic Grants to States, 401
  Bilingual, see Bilingual Vocational Programs
  Consumer and Homemaker Education, 402, 403
  Programs for the Disadvantaged, 401, 402, 404
  Programs for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives, 405
  Research and Occupational Information, 404
Vocational Rehabilitation:
  Centers for Independent Living, 333
  Migratory Farmworkers, 330
  Projects With Industry, 332
  Rehabilitation Services, Basic Support, 325
  Secondary Education and Transition Services, 314
  Severely Handicapped, 328

Women's Educational Equity, 106, 115
Work-Study, College 506